

## SENATE.

FRIDAY, February 5, 1915.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we thank Thee that Thou hast come so close to human life that we dare not make an appeal to our fellow men that does not justify the ways of God with men. Every appeal that we make to human activity and human service, whether for justice or for liberty, is but a reflection of the commanding voice of God, and every aspiration that rises within us that looks to human helpfulness, to the uplift of the race, is but an emanation of the heart of God overflowing with an infinite love for man. May we cherish as our most precious and blessed heritage the spirit that prompts to service. May we in all our service conform our action and our appeal to God, who is the author of our liberty and the guardian of our human rights. We ask for Christ's sake. Amen.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

## PRESIDENTIAL APPROVAL.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Latta, executive clerk, announced that the President had, on January 28, 1915, approved and signed the act (S. 6121) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Niagara River, in the town of Lewiston, in the county of Niagara and State of New York.

## ANNUAL REPORT OF COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Commissioner of Patents, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the business of the Patent Office for the year ended December 31, 1914. The Chair is in doubt as to what committee the communication should be referred. It will be referred to the Committee on Printing.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. JONES. I have here a telegram sent by the secretary of state of the State of Washington under the direction of a resolution of the legislature of that State. It relates to the veto by the President of the immigration bill, which has been disposed of for this session; but coming, as it does, from the legislature, I think it would be well to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OLYMPIA, WASH., February 4, 1915.

HON. WESLEY L. JONES,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Whereas there is now pending in the Congress of the United States the Burnett-Dillingham immigration bill; and  
Whereas the same is to be brought up for action on the President's veto Thursday, February 4, 1915: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Washington in legislative session assembled, That the secretary of state of the State of Washington be, and he is hereby, directed to telegraph to each member of the delegation in Congress from this State a request to vote for the passage of the said Burnett-Dillingham immigration bill over the President's veto.

I. M. HOWELL,  
Secretary of State.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I present a resolution from the Rural Credit League of America on rural credits, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD without reading.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution adopted by the Rural Credit League of America indorsing the principles of the resolution by Senator SHEPPARD to investigate personal rural-credit bills.

We maintain that the function of a congressional body to investigate a purely scientific question, like credit, is judicial rather than legislative; and being judicial in character, its machinery should comport with that of other judicial bodies, which provide that the interested parties may appear by expert representatives and establish by sworn testimony the truth of their contentions. We hold this to be the most efficient, most expeditious, and most economical method of conducting an investigation of this important subject.

It is the most efficient, because the commission could require the proponent's expert to take up his bill section by section and show his precedent for each and every provision or state his reason for not following the precedents and experience of other countries. Then the bankers' expert would be present to test the credibility of each witness introduced by the proponent's expert. The commissioners would not only have the right to interrogate any witness introduced and introduce other witnesses, but they would confine the experts of the parties at interest to the issues involved and not encumber the record with immaterial matter. Furthermore, the commission could, and doubtless would, require each of the parties to brief his case, and this would greatly aid the full membership of both bodies of Congress in readily grasping the question.

This is the most expeditious method, because if an investigation were to be conducted in the ordinary way it would be next January before the committees could begin work; whereas under the proposed method the record and report of the commission and briefs and arguments of

the parties at interest could be placed in the hands of each Member of the Sixty-fourth Congress at the beginning of its first session.

The expense to the Government in conducting the proposed investigation would be nominal compared to the expense of conducting other monetary investigations. It would be less expensive than an ordinary committee investigation, because the commission could, and should, require each party to pay for the attendance of its own witnesses.

In conclusion we would say that we suggest that the Committees on Agriculture appoint the subcommittees to make this investigation, because every member of both of those committees has bankers as well as farmers as constituents, and we do not know of any other instance in which that thing exists as to all the members of any other two committees of both bodies.

Mr. FLETCHER. I present resolutions adopted by the Board of Trade of Miami, Fla., which I ask may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolutions of the Miami Board of Trade, of Miami, Fla.

Whereas the United States, by its act of Congress approved September 28, 1850, did grant to the several States the lands known as "swamp and overflow" lands, made unfit thereby for cultivation, to enable the States to contract drainage works to reclaim the lands; and

Whereas said act provided that the proceeds of said lands shall be applied exclusively to the purpose of reclaiming said lands, and thereby imposing the trust upon the States of reclaiming said lands and making them fit for cultivation and disposing of said lands for the uses and purposes of said trust only; and

Whereas the State of Florida requested and received upward of 20,000,000 acres of such "swamp and overflowed" lands, which include the Everglades of Florida, an open prairie overflowed by the flood waters of the upper drainage basin carried by the Kissimmee River to Lake Okeechobee and spilled over upon the grass-covered plain of the Glades; and

Whereas the control of the waters of Lake Okeechobee and its use as a storage basin for flood waters to prevent overflow, and the vast extent of the canals and other drainage works necessary to reclaim the 4,000,000 acres of the Everglades, make it necessary to raise large amounts of money, and only by first reclaiming and making fit for cultivation said lands can they be sold for sufficient money to pay for the construction of the necessary drainage works; and

Whereas the trustees of the lands have been unable to sell the lands for sufficient money to construct the necessary drainage works and can not sell the undrained lands without a sacrifice of value so great as to defeat the purpose of the grant of the United States and many thousands of purchasers of these lands are waiting the reclamation of the lands to settle upon and cultivate them; and

Whereas the United States has by its said act of September 28, 1850, declared its purpose to aid the States to reclaim these rich and fertile areas and make them fit for cultivation: Now therefore be it

Resolved, That we do respectfully pray the good offices of the United States, by its representatives in Congress assembled, to aid the States to reclaim the swamp and overflowed lands by its grants to the States by enacting suitable provisions in a drainage-aid act, which shall enable the States to raise sufficient money to construct the necessary drainage works; saving, however, the United States harmless from loss or gift of money by pledging to it the taxes which may be levied upon and the proceeds from sales of said swamp and overflowed lands in each drainage project of said lands; and be it further

Resolved, That the Senators and Representatives of the State of Florida are respectively requested to use all honorable means to cause the enactment of such drainage-aid law.

Mr. NELSON. I present a large number of petitions from citizens of Minnesota, asking for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the shipment of arms and munitions of war to belligerents. I move that they be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. KENYON. I present resolutions of the Cedar Rapids Federation of Labor in reference to the shipping bill, and I ask to have them read. They are very short.

There being no objection, the resolutions were read, as follows:

CEDAR RAPIDS FEDERATION OF LABOR,  
Cedar Rapids, Iowa, January 15, 1915.

HON. W. S. KENYON,  
Senator from Iowa, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The following resolution, unanimously adopted by the above body, is hereby submitted to your kind support:

"Whereas the best interests of all the people of this country will be impartially protected and served only by a Government-owned merchant marine, the upbuilding of which, even in private hands, has so far insidiously been prevented by foreign interests, carrying nine-tenths of the American products in foreign bottoms, but which service broke down on account of the European war, thus leaving our country almost bare of the so necessary transportation facilities for our products to other countries desirous of buying from or trading with us, to the great detriment of our economic interests, and especially those of the laboring population: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Cedar Rapids Federation of Labor hereby respectfully asks all similar organizations, and especially our State Federation of Iowa and the American Federation of Labor, as well as our Congressmen and His Excellency President Wilson (all of whom to be notified by this body), to use their best efforts for the passage of the Government ship-purchase bill; but be it further

Resolved, That we are utterly opposed to the further recommendation of President Wilson; i. e., that this service should be turned over to private capitalists after our Government has brought it to a paying basis with public funds. This would not only invite a certain recurrence of the above calamities, but also turn the national interests of all the people, which can properly be protected by the Government only (as disastrous experiences with railroads and other national institutions have abundantly proven), over to the mercy of its greedy exploiters and egotistic despoilers, which would be worse than turning over the

post-office or the parcel-post systems, now that they have been brought to a paying basis, to the express companies."

Very truly, yours,

[SEAL.]

D. MORRISON,  
Secretary-Treasurer.

Mr. OLIVER. I have a short telegram protesting against the ship-purchase bill, which I ask to have read.

There being no objection, the telegram was read, as follows:

GREENVILLE, PA., February 5, 1915.

Senators PENROSE and OLIVER,  
Washington, D. C.:

Hold Pennsylvania hot in opposition to ship bill purchasing scheme, for country has been driven far enough hellward and over to socialism and war.

W. LOOSER.

Mr. KERN. I ask to have read the telegram which I send to the desk.

There being no objection, the telegram was read, as follows:

CHARLESTON, S. C., January 30, 1915.

JOHN W. KERN,  
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:

The directors of the Charleston Chamber of Commerce adopted resolution indorsing the principles involved in the ship-purchase bill as the bill now stands.

B. F. McLEOD, President.

Mr. BRANDEGEE presented a memorial of sundry citizens of New Haven, Conn., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to prohibit the intermarriage of persons of the white and negro races within the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. BRISTOW presented petitions of sundry citizens of Kansas City, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation to grant pensions to civil-service employees, which were referred to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Cawker City and Winfield, in the State of Kansas, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to curtail the freedom of the press, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. McLEAN presented a petition of Schiller Lodge, No. 92, Independent Order of Odd Fellows, of Middletown, Conn., and a petition of the congregation of the German Lutheran Church, of New Britain, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of Local Union No. 127, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, of Derby, Conn., and a petition of the Metal Trades Council of Hartford, Conn., praying for the passage of the immigration bill over the President's veto, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Metal Trades Council of Hartford, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation relating to trades in the Army, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of New Haven, Conn., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to prohibit the intermarriage of white and colored persons in the District of Columbia, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a petition of Local Union No. 321, Cigar Makers' International Union, of New Britain, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate interstate commerce in convict-made goods, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of the Board of Trade and Business Men's Association of Willimantic, Conn., and a memorial of Centennial Lodge, No. 100, Independent Order of Odd Fellows, of Naugatuck, Conn., remonstrating against any change in the present law affecting the printing of Government return envelopes, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN presented a petition of the congregation of the St. Paul's Evangelical Lutheran Church, of Portland, Oreg., and a petition of sundry citizens of Oregon City, Oreg., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CLAPP. I present a joint resolution of the Legislature of Minnesota, which I ask may be printed in the Record and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Mr. Bendixen offers the following resolution:

"Whereas it has been proposed and is being urged from various sources that the Congress of the United States place an embargo on the exportation of agricultural products; and

"Whereas this is not being urged on the ground of any shortage or prospective shortage of such products but on the ground that prices have recently advanced somewhat, especially on cereal products; and

"Whereas such embargo would be unjust and unfair to the agricultural interests of this State in that it would deprive such interests of the advantages and benefits derived from the demand from foreign nations for these products; and

"Whereas the agricultural interests of this Nation by Federal legislation have been placed in direct competition with the same interests of other nations and are justly entitled to all the advantages of an open world market; and

"Whereas the State of Minnesota is preeminently an agricultural State and would suffer greatly from such embargo, and all its business interests would be seriously affected by the injury that would logically and necessarily follow such embargo: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Minnesota House of Representatives, the Senate concurring, earnestly and emphatically request the Representatives in Congress and United States Senators from this State to use their influence and vote to defeat any measure proposing such embargo; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the house and secretary of the Senate be, and hereby are, instructed to forward a copy of these resolutions to each of the Representatives in Congress and each Senator from this State."

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. SHIVELY, from the Committee on Pensions, submitted a report (No. 964) accompanied by a bill (S. 7566) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors, which was read twice by its title, the bill being a substitute for the following Senate bills heretofore referred to that committee:

S. 370. Mary A. Attmore.

S. 989. Josiah L. Burton.

S. 1120. Charles L. Greene.

S. 1650. Ida A. Mitchell.

S. 1806. Mary J. Forbes.

S. 1819. Sarah E. C. Emerson.

S. 2006. John H. Churchill.

S. 2135. Richard Woods.

S. 2281. John Banks.

S. 2185. Mollie C. Warren.

S. 2187. Lucinda Traub.

S. 2195. Samuel W. Harden.

S. 2298. Albert N. Raymond.

S. 2394. Charles R. Gentner.

S. 3177. Rodney Jones.

S. 3425. David H. Hall.

S. 3460. Moses H. Laughlin.

S. 3759. Robert I. Morrison.

S. 3815. Lou E. Hecox.

S. 3998. Peter L. Miles.

S. 5399. Thomas Hickman.

S. 5750. Eliza J. Arthur.

S. 5832. Bettie Dodge.

S. 6132. Maria Love.

S. 6262. Robert Degray.

S. 6263. Luther Curtis.

S. 6372. Orlando L. Daugherty.

S. 6456. Martha E. Messenger.

S. 6470. Minna Schue.

S. 6471. Gordon P. Ostrander.

S. 6476. William W. Chew.

S. 6487. Minerva M. Walsh.

S. 6521. Ellen Garlick.

S. 6523. Sarah E. H. Bartlett.

S. 6553. George Schmidt.

S. 6566. George Fulford.

S. 6628. George W. Weitzel.

S. 6654. William M. Allen.

S. 6668. Catherine C. Abbott.

S. 6678. Samuel Lilly.

S. 6813. Edwin Forbes.

S. 6814. James W. Toler.

S. 6816. George Wort.

S. 6817. George W. Markland.

S. 6818. William A. Rusie.

S. 6844. Reuben F. Longley.

S. 6873. Anna Mott.

S. 6875. Thomas Shapley.

S. 6903. Cleora A. Carver.

S. 6908. Mary A. Lowry.

S. 6909. Wiley Whicher.

S. 6921. Amos Poe.

S. 6935. Martin Perkins, alias Charles Shepherd.

S. 7088. Florence Ada Tinney.

S. 7093. Susan J. Alexander.

S. 7094. John H. Van Meter.

S. 7100. Lewis C. Lane.

S. 7119. Imogene M. Burk.

S. 7133. H. B. Crouch.

S. 7135. Mathew Crawford.

S. 7139. Joseph Raphle.

S. 7142. Jonathan Sargent.  
 S. 7144. John P. Simpson.  
 S. 7146. Albert Baur.  
 S. 7157. Thomas T. Jones.  
 S. 7161. David Cox.  
 S. 7171. Richard Dobson.  
 S. 7175. Joseph H. Dearborn.  
 S. 7176. Sarah L. Hammerton.  
 S. 7177. Theresa L. Breese.  
 S. 7181. Thomas E. Dunbar.  
 S. 7195. Ephraim D. Edwards.  
 S. 7202. Nelson B. Tool.  
 S. 7204. Josiah Hasbrook.  
 S. 7218. Irena Ward.  
 S. 7228. John W. Fletcher.  
 S. 7244. James Menaugh.  
 S. 7246. Michael Kirk.  
 S. 7248. George W. Windell.  
 S. 7249. Benjamin F. Shepherd.  
 S. 7254. William R. Minert.  
 S. 7260. Allen C. Goodwin.  
 S. 7265. Daniel H. Pettengill.  
 S. 7276. Olive Lunn.  
 S. 7290. Harriett S. Crooks.  
 S. 7295. William H. McKinley.  
 S. 7301. James F. Hobbs.  
 S. 7311. Evander V. Turner.  
 S. 7312. Mary E. Clark.  
 S. 7315. Elizabeth M. Norton.  
 S. 7327. Alicen W. Poe.  
 S. 7330. Mary E. Searle.  
 S. 7331. Thomas M. Wall.  
 S. 7332. Hugh M. Cory.  
 S. 7342. Madison T. Trent.  
 S. 7344. Rose Barnes.  
 S. 7349. Lewis A. Huffaker.  
 S. 7351. David Parker.  
 S. 7408. Edward Dudevoire.  
 S. 7469. William Hawkins.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, from the Committee on Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 19746) to authorize aids to navigation and other works in the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 965) thereon.

#### PAN AMERICAN MEDICAL CONGRESS.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I am instructed by the Committee on Foreign Relations to report back favorably without amendment the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 210) to authorize the President to invite certain Governments to send delegates to the Pan American Medical Congress, and I submit a report (No. 966) thereon. I ask for the present consideration of the joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be read.

The Secretary read the joint resolution, as follows:

*Resolved, etc.,* That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and requested to invite the several Governments of the Republics of Mexico, Central and South America, Haiti, and Santo Domingo to send official delegates to the meeting of the Pan American Medical Congress, to be held in the city of San Francisco, Cal., Panama-Pacific International Exposition, June 17, 18, 19, 20, and 21, A. D. 1915.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Delaware asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution.

Mr. JONES. Does it involve any expense on the part of this Government?

Mr. SAULSBURY. Mr. President, the Committee on Foreign Relations took the matter under consideration and referred the joint resolution to a subcommittee. It appears by former resolutions which have been passed regarding this matter that while it is possible an appropriation may be asked, yet Dr. Johnson, who presides over the society in this city, has filed with the subcommittee, and it will be a part of the records of the committee which submits the report, a statement that in no event shall the amount asked for exceed \$10,000.

I wish to say, in order to avoid objection, that this Congress is composed of a great body of medical men all over the Americas, North and South, and meetings have been held not only here in the first instance, but in Panama, in the city of Mexico, and in Habana. On all those occasions the Governments have always appropriated a sum of money to defray, for example, the expenses of a banquet to be attended by the members. The gentlemen who compose this very valuable association are extremely desirous that it shall not appear that the Government is refusing to bear any expense and that they can

simply come as private citizens if they want to. They think it a very important matter, and the committee agree with them on that. We have limited the expense as far as we could.

Mr. JONES. I would like to know if it will result in the establishment of a sort of bureau controlled by other Governments to which we will have to send representatives and the expense of which we shall bear very largely? That has been the case in a great many other instances.

Mr. SAULSBURY. It is the first time I have heard such a suggestion made by anyone.

Mr. JONES. My colleague upon the Committee on Appropriations, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN], can bear me out in the statement that a great many of these things have come about just in that way, and I simply want to bring this matter to his attention. If he has no objection to it as representing the majority of the Committee on Appropriations I shall not object, but I shall expect to see it result in just what we tried to cut out of the Diplomatic and Consular appropriation bill last year.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, there have been some dozen or more resolutions of this kind which passed Congress from time to time, whereby these different scientific experts may go to foreign countries and their expenses are paid. They seem to establish a bureau at some capital, like the Hague or Potsdam, or somewhere else, and then bind the United States to become a continuing member. For example, I had a case before me this morning; and I will say to my colleague on the committee that we concluded to strike out a good many of such items from the appropriation bills, there are so many delegates making trips to Europe. We found that they had bound this Government with other Governments that they would hold an annual meeting over there, and then they would establish a bureau, and all such things. The meetings are held abroad so that our delegates get a trip to Europe, and we have to pay the expenses. This morning we heard of one such congress that is to be held at Potsdam, and over \$3,000 was asked to be appropriated for it—\$500 to pay the expenses over there and \$500 extra, and so on. I have forgotten the exact amount, but it amounts to about \$3,500. Our continuing expenses are \$1,500 to pay our bureau and for this system of representation. All these things amount to a great deal of money at the end of a year.

I was astonished, and so was my friend from Washington [Mr. JONES], when I came to look into this appropriation bill, at the large sums of money it appropriated, not in one case but in dozens of cases, and to find that in the bill the United States had bound itself to have these delegates go abroad and attend the meetings of associations, resulting in establishing a great bureau in which no American is employed. Here we are paying for the employment of foreigners in some bureau in a foreign country in order that some Americans can attend every year some convention to be held. We pay his expenses and pay all the necessary incidentals, and so on.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. McCUMBER. I do not intend to object to the consideration of this joint resolution, but I wish the Senator from Delaware would explain to what persons in Mexico we are to extend this invitation.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I do not know whether Dr. Carranza has a medical title or not; I have sometimes heard him called by that title; nor do I know whether Dr. Huerta has one, but any of them might attend that meeting with profit to themselves. I want to say, however, Mr. President, that it seemed to the committee having this matter in charge that this was a particularly laudable object at this time, and a courteous invitation only was desired to be extended to these gentlemen.

We have taken a very prominent part, both in North and South America, in trying to do away with infectious or contagious diseases. We have been called upon, I think, recently in Ecuador to make sanitary the condition at Guayaquil, which is threatening our traffic through the Panama Canal.

Mr. McCUMBER. I wish to say to the Senator from Delaware that I simply want to make sure that we are extending the invitation through the proper President of Mexico, whether it be Villa or whomsoever it may be to-day or to-morrow.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I think it might be well to call upon the leader of the majority now existing upon that side of the Chamber as to what we are going to do in regard to this. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] introduced this joint resolution, and I know he is very much in favor of it. So I ask him to reply to his own colleague.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I introduced the joint resolution because I am very greatly interested in the matter of sanitation and health, not only in our own country but through-

out the world. It will be admitted that we can not have our own country free from contagious and epidemic diseases unless the matter is discussed and considered by other Governments as well as ours.

This is a great medical association. It has received the courtesies of other Governments; delegates have been sent from the United States, and have been treated with great consideration; these important questions have been discussed and the results have been published. I have myself read them with great interest and, I think, some profit. Now, it is designed that this association shall be invited to meet in this country. There may be later on some suggestion as to a small appropriation for the purpose of reciprocating courtesies which our own delegates have received from these other Governments.

It is a trivial matter, Mr. President. I see no danger of it ever resulting in the establishment of a bureau or that we shall be involved in any financial obligation that will become troublesome to us. If Congress does not choose to make an appropriation when the matter is presented to it later on, of course Congress will not make the appropriation; but unquestionably the invitation ought to be extended. We can not very well do ourselves justice without extending the invitation, and I trust no objection will be made to the passage of the joint resolution.

Mr. OVERMAN. I understand the joint resolution does not provide for any appropriation?

Mr. GALLINGER. It does not.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS.

Mr. WILLIAMS. By direction of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report back favorably without amendment Senate resolution 529, and I ask for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] on the 2d instant, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, or any subcommittee thereof, be authorized during the Sixty-third Congress to subpoena witnesses, to send for books and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a price not to exceed \$1 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be pending before the said committee; that the committee may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate, and the expense thereof shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Mississippi if there are any contemplated hearings to be had by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will say, for the information of the Senator from Utah, that this is what has happened: The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, thinking that it had authority to hold certain hearings, employed a stenographer, and it owes him money for his work. He can not be paid. I told him that the committee would have to obtain the authority of the Senate through a resolution before payment could be made. The resolution was therefore offered and referred to the committee, and I have been authorized to report it back favorably.

Mr. SMOOT. It seems to me, under the wording of the resolution, it would be to pay for hearings hereafter to be had and not for hearings which have already taken place.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The committee contemplates the possibility of having to continue its hearings. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON], who offered the resolution, is not in his seat just at this moment, but I understand the committee think there is a possibility, though not any very great probability, of the continuance of some of the hearings.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

The resolution was agreed to.

#### LABELING AND MISBRANDING OF GOODS.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, before bills are received I desire to ask a question concerning a bill that has been reported. I address my observations to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE].

I find on the calendar Senate bill 646, providing for the labeling and tagging of all fabrics and articles of clothing intended for sale which enter into interstate commerce, and providing penalties for misbranding.

This bill seems to have been reported from the Committee on Manufactures. I am a member of that committee, but I never heard of a meeting of the committee nor was I consulted as to the matter of the report. As I have received communications concerning the bill, in which complaint is made that no hearing was held on the subject and that there are certain parties who desire a hearing, I will ask the Senator from Ohio if it would not be compatible with his views to have the bill recommitted to the committee for the purpose of giving certain interested parties an opportunity to be heard?

Mr. POMERENE. That bill was referred by the Committee on Manufactures to a subcommittee, of which I was a member. The matter was taken up with the department. As a member of that committee I was not advised that any individuals desired any personal hearing on the matter. The bill seemed to have the indorsement of the department. I knew of no objection—I say that individually—on the part of any interested parties to the provisions of the bill until very recently. The matter is now being considered by the members of the committee in view of the fact that certain persons have indicated a desire to be heard. No later than this morning one of the members of the subcommittee and myself had a conference on the subject. We expect to have a further conference during the day, and if the matter may be allowed to rest for the day I think there can be something determined upon which will be entirely satisfactory to those who are seeking a hearing.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have no disposition to press any suggestion at all, but I thought it was rather remarkable that I had never been notified of the meeting of the committee, as I have some views on the matter which I would have desired in my usual modest way to present to the committee had I been notified of a meeting and had the privilege of attending.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, as one member of the committee, I did not know the Senator from New Hampshire was interested in the subject. Had I known of the fact, he certainly would have been advised. The subcommittee was authorized to report on the bill, as I now recall.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I am gratified to know that the subject is being given further consideration, for it is a very important matter which will lead to a good deal of discussion if it comes before the Senate unless certain matters are adjusted in connection with it.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I may say that, since these objections have come to my attention, my personal feeling about the matter is that there ought to be some further hearings on the bill with a view to perfecting it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The introduction of bills is next in order.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. THOMAS:

A bill (S. 7567) granting a pension to James Gallagher (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 7568) granting an increase of pension to Gilbert W. Potter (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

A bill (S. 7569) granting a pension to Charles H. Nelson; A bill (S. 7570) granting a pension to Sumner P. Boies; and A bill (S. 7571) granting an increase of pension to Joann P. Swift-Libby; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WHITE:

A bill (S. 7572) for the relief of the heirs of Eldred Nunnally, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MYERS:

A bill (S. 7573) granting a pension to Anna Trickey; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McCUMBER:

A bill (S. 7574) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Walker; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NELSON (by request):

A bill (S. 7575) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend laws for preventing collisions of vessels and to regulate equipment of certain motor boats on the navigable waters of the United States," approved June 9, 1910; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. CATRON:

A bill (S. 7576) granting a pension to John Lilly (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROOT:

A bill (S. 7577) granting an increase of pension to Orra M. Duncan;

A bill (S. 7578) granting a pension to Josephine W. Bullis; and

A bill (S. 7579) granting a pension to Georgianna G. Furey; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BURLEIGH:

A bill (S. 7580) granting a pension to Elias Lyon; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHIELDS:

A bill (S. 7581) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Shell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROOT:

A bill (S. 7582) granting an increase of pension to Charles P. Cook; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COLT:

A bill (S. 7583) granting an increase of pension to Fannie Reid (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

#### RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. STERLING submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill (H. R. 20189), which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

Mr. SAULSBURY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill (H. R. 20189), which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

#### THE LIGHTHOUSE SERVICE.

Mr. PERKINS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 19746) to authorize aids to navigation and other works in the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

#### AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. WARREN submitted an amendment proposing to increase the appropriation for investigating the food habits of North American birds and mammals in relation to agriculture, horticulture, forestry, etc., from \$110,000 to \$360,000, intended to be proposed by him to the Agricultural appropriation bill (H. R. 20415), which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed.

Mr. THORNTON (for Mr. BANKHEAD) submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$225 to pay Fay N. Seaton for extra services rendered to the Committee to Investigate Joint Parcel Post, intended to be proposed by him to the general deficiency appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. POINDEXTER submitted an amendment proposing to increase the appropriation for the control of pests of orchard and other fruits from \$56,115 to \$58,255, intended to be proposed by him to the Agricultural appropriation bill (H. R. 20415), which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed.

#### SUPERINTENDENT OF POST OFFICE.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I submit an amendment intended to be proposed by me to the Post Office appropriation bill (H. R. 19906), and ask that it be read and referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

The amendment was read and referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, as follows:

Strike out line 8, on page 5, and in lieu thereof substitute the following:

"The office of postmaster is hereby abolished, except in third and fourth class offices, and in lieu thereof is created the office of superintendent of post office. Each post office of the first and second classes shall be in charge of a superintendent. In each office where there is an assistant postmaster such assistant postmaster shall be appointed to the office of superintendent of post office if qualified therefor, and shall hold the same subject to the laws and regulations of the classified civil service. Thereafter all appointments to the office of superintendent of post office shall be made upon merit, and, where practicable, by promotion or transfer from the employees of the Postal Service, and shall hold the office without regard to politics or political recommendations, upon the terms and conditions and subject to such tenure as is provided by the laws and regulations governing the classified, permanent civil service. For compensation to such superintendents of post offices there is hereby appropriated \$15,000,000. This section shall not apply to postmasters now in office whose terms have not expired, but they shall be allowed to serve out the term for which they were appointed."

#### THE MERCHANT MARINE.

Mr. LEWIS. I tender an amendment to the present pending shipping bill (H. R. 6856), and ask to have it printed and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, that action will be taken.

The amendment is as follows:

Amend section 1, on page 2, after the words "objects and purposes," in line 8, by adding:

"Provided, That no purchase of ships from any source whatever, or of foreign subject or of any ship belonging to any foreign country, shall be made until the Department of Justice and Department of State has certified that it has examined the title of the tendered ship and that the same is available in all respects and free from any question involving any international complication or violation of any international law."

#### SHIPMENT OF AMERICAN MANUFACTURES.

Mr. FLETCHER. I have here a communication from the Secretary of Commerce, which I desire to have printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The communication is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,  
Washington, February 4, 1915.

HON. DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I quote the following from a letter to me dated 29th January, from the George P. Plant Milling Co., St. Louis:

"On December 8 we made a contract with the Holland-America Line to transport 20,000 sacks of flour from New Orleans to Rotterdam at the rate of 47 cents per 100 pounds, with the understanding that we were to ship the flour from the interior in January and furnish them with the necessary permit of the Holland Government, and they, under the contract, were bound to clear the flour in February. We sold this 20,000 sacks of flour to the Netherlands Government through our agent in Amsterdam, Holland, and made an identical contract with the Netherlands Government; that is, they were to furnish us with the necessary permit and we were to guarantee the clearance of the flour during February."

"We have complied with our contract, having shipped 20,000 sacks of flour from here between the 20th and 25th of January; we also secured the necessary permit through the office of the Holland-America Line in New York City, who in turn advised their office in New Orleans that this 20,000 sacks of flour would move under permit N. Y. P. 880, but in the last week the agents of the Holland-America Line in New Orleans, who are the Texas Transport & Terminal Co., have used every means in their power to stop us from shipping the flour, and have advised us that they will not clear the flour in February, and certainly not till March or April."

"Our representatives in New Orleans have intimated that whereas we have this freight booked at 47 cents per 100 pounds and the Holland-America Line are now getting a rate of 70 cents per 100 pounds, that this difference in the revenue to be earned by them accounts for their attitude; but we can not believe that such a company as the Holland-America Line would stoop to such a position, and we believe that if some pressure is brought to bear upon the line by your department that we not only can secure a fulfillment of the contract that we have with them, but that their attitude toward contracts they have with others will be quite satisfactory hereafter."

"We will be pleased to have you take this matter up with the Holland-America Line if you will, both at their New York City office and their New Orleans office, and if you wish any further information in the matter we will be pleased to supply same by telegraph if you will advise us what is necessary."

I have instructed the representatives of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce of this department in New Orleans and New York to look further into this matter.

Yours, very truly,

WILLIAM C. REDFIELD,  
Secretary.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,  
Washington, February 3, 1915.

HON. DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I hand you, for such use as you may think fit, copy of letter from the Utilities Manufacturing Co., which I find upon my desk on my return to-day, and which speaks for itself. The last paragraph seems to me worthy of publication.

Yours, very truly,

WILLIAM C. REDFIELD,  
Secretary.

UTILITIES MANUFACTURING CO.,  
18 Broadway, New York, January 26, 1915.

W. C. REDFIELD, Esq.,

Secretary of Commerce, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We have read with great interest your brilliant defense of the plan of the United States Government to purchase ships in order to make possible the shipment of American manufactures to foreign markets and bring back to this country the products of the South American countries, in particular, who are suffering from a lack of communication and who are therefore unable to make purchases, not having any market for their products.

We need hardly say that your plan has our heartiest moral support, and in addition to the records that you have already gathered on the subject we desire to inform you that just because of this serious lack of shipping facilities and because of the corresponding outrageously high freight rates we have lost a very large order from a firm in Alexandria, Egypt, and another one from a firm in Auckland, New Zealand, to whom we had quoted and who had given us their orders amounting to many thousand dollars, and both of which firms were forced to cancel the shipment by cable on account of the very high freight rates which would have made the retail price of our products prohibitive in their country. With an adequate American merchant marine it would be impossible for the few operating companies (English and French) to monopolize the freight rates and dictate to the American public what they must ship and at what prices. To speak in plain words, the situation has become so serious as regards our export business that we have had to give up free on board quotations, which, as you may know, are so essential, and as a consequence our business has suffered very badly in spite of the fact that the foreign competition during the past three months has been minimized and one of the best advertised brands and greatest sellers in almost every foreign country has had their plant destroyed by the war. We have been forced to lay off part of our help and are losing this rare chance of extending our business for no other reason excepting the lack of fur-

nishing at reasonable prices our merchandise which is in such great demand at the present time.

Yours, very truly,

UTILITIES MANUFACTURING CO.

#### AMENDMENT OF THE RULES.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, under the rule I desire to present a notice that on to-morrow I shall move an amendment to the rules. On to-morrow I shall ask that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Rules, as I have no idea that it could possibly secure the attention of this body at the present session; but I want to have it presented now in order that it may receive such consideration as it will deserve with a view of passing it at the extra session, which everyone admits is soon to follow, at which time I shall ask for its consideration and adoption, if possible.

Mr. GALLINGER. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. NORRIS. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. Did I understand the Senator to say that everyone admits we are to have an extra session?

Mr. NORRIS. Whether everyone admits it or not, I presume it is unavoidable under all the circumstances.

Mr. GALLINGER. Suppose we should be wise enough to take up the appropriation bills and pass them, would there be any necessity for an extra session?

Mr. NORRIS. No; I should not think so.

Mr. GALLINGER. I hope that may be done.

Mr. NORRIS. I doubt whether we are going to be wise enough to get through with the business of the session.

I ask to have the proposed rule read, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be read.

The notice of an amendment to the rules was read, as follows:

In accordance with Rule XL of the Senate, I hereby give notice that on to-morrow I will propose an amendment to the rules of the Senate by adding thereto a new rule, as follows:

"Rule XL. It shall be in order during the morning hour to make a motion that any bill or resolution then on the calendar shall be considered under the terms of this rule. Such motion, when made, shall lie over one day and shall then be decided without debate. When it has been decided to consider a bill or resolution under this rule, the same shall first be considered in general debate, during which time no Senator, except by unanimous consent, shall be allowed to speak more than three hours. At the close of general debate the bill or resolution shall be read for amendments, and on any amendment that may be offered no Senator, except by unanimous consent, shall speak for more than 15 minutes: *Provided*, That any Senator who has not spoken for 3 hours in general debate shall, in addition to said 15 minutes, be allowed additional time; but in no case shall such additional time or times, including the time used by such Senator in general debate, exceed in the aggregate 3 hours. When the bill is being read for amendment all debate shall be confined to the amendment which is then pending."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The notice will lie on the table.

#### THE OLD ROMAN SENATE.

Mr. GORE. I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a public document a history of the rules of procedure of the old Roman Senate.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask the Senator what is his request? I could not catch it.

Mr. GORE. The request is to have printed as a Senate document a history of the rules of procedure of the old Roman Senate.

Mr. SMOOT. For what year, I will ask the Senator?

Mr. GORE. It covers a number of years, about as many years as debate lasts in the Senate.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Is it accompanied by the rulings of the Chair?

Mr. GORE. It covers about as many years as an ordinary debate lasts in the Senate.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that the matter be referred to the Committee on Printing.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On objection, the matter will be referred to the Committee on Printing.

#### WAGES ON AMERICAN AND BRITISH VESSELS.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I have had carefully compiled a comparison of American and British wages paid on two steam colliers, one a British collier of 4,200 gross tons and the other an American collier of 4,417 tons. It is an interesting statement, and I ask consent to have it printed in the Record without reading.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Comparison of American and British wages paid on steam colliers.

AMERICAN COLLIER "LYRA."

(4,417 gross tons.)

Master	\$260.00
Chief officer	100.00
Second officer	85.00
Third officer	70.00
Carpenter	55.00
8 sailors	400.00

Steward	\$75.00
Chief cook	75.00
Second cook	60.00
3 messmen	110.00
Chief engineer	150.00
First assistant engineer	100.00
Second assistant engineer	85.00
Third assistant engineer	70.00
3 oilers	165.00
6 firemen	330.00
3 coal passers	135.00

Total per month 2,265.00  
Total per year 27,180.00

BRITISH STEAMSHIP "MASCONOMO."

(4,200 gross tons.)

Master	\$121.50
First mate	48.00
Second mate	34.02
Third mate	25.51
Carpenter	31.59
Boatswain	25.51
Steward	31.59
Engineer steward	12.15
Cook	26.73
Mess-room boy	4.80
8 able seamen	174.96
First engineer	80.19
Second engineer	58.32
Third engineer	38.88
Fourth engineer	34.02
8 firemen	184.68
2 oilers	46.17

Total per month 979.28  
Total per year 11,751.36

Annual difference in wages, \$15,428.64.

NOTE.—The wages given for the *Lyra* are the union rate for white crew on the Pacific coast. Sailors, firemen, coal passers, etc., can be shipped in the Atlantic-coast trade at from \$15 to \$20 per month less than in the Pacific; but the wages of officers and engineers, who usually stay by the ship, are nearly as high now in the Atlantic as in the Pacific.

#### Charges based on cost of construction.

	American Lyra.	British Masconomo.
First cost	\$325,000	\$217,000
Interest, 5 per cent.	16,250	10,850
Depreciation, 5 per cent.	16,250	10,850
Insurance, 6 per cent.	19,500	13,020
Total	52,000	34,720

Annual difference in charges based on cost of construction, \$17,280.

#### COST OF FOOD.

American crew—35 men, at 50 cents per day, for 365 days	\$6,387.50
British crew—32 men, at 40 cents per day, for 365 days	4,672.00

Annual difference in cost of food	1,715.50
Annual difference in wages	15,428.64
Annual difference in charges based on construction	17,280.00

Annual difference in operating American and British collier 34,424.14

#### THE MERCHANT MARINE.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. GORE. I desire to offer a resolution (S. Res. 537) and move its adoption under Rule XXVI. For the present I ask that the resolution be read and that the motion go over under the rule for a day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read.

The Secretary read as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Commerce is hereby discharged from the further consideration of Senate bill 7552.

Mr. GALLINGER. Let the resolution go over under the rule.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will go over under the rule.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Oklahoma if the resolution which he has just offered relates to the bill which the Senator himself introduced on Wednesday last?

Mr. GORE. Yes, sir.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Which was referred to the Committee on Commerce yesterday?

Mr. GORE. Yes, sir.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The Senator has become impatient at the lack of action?

Mr. GORE. Oh, no, Mr. President; I profess to have an unlimited amount of patience. I think the Committee on Commerce will have ample time to deliberate on this bill before the motion comes up for consideration.

## PURCHASE OF VESSELS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a previous day, which will be stated.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 528) submitted by Mr. BURTON on the second instant, as follows:

Whereas the pending ship-purchase bill, being Senate bill No. 6856, contemplating by certain of its provisions the purchase of shipping tonnage already constructed, and therefore suggests the possible acquisition of ships belonging to belligerents, some of which are interned in American and other ports as the result of the war; and Whereas the purchase of such vessels would raise questions of vital importance to the interests of the United States, a knowledge of which is of supreme importance in order that the Senate may reach an intelligent conclusion as to the advisability of enacting said bill and as to the propriety of incorporating in its provisions certain amendments: Be it

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be requested and is hereby directed to transmit at his earliest convenience to the Senate of the United States information responsive to the following inquiry:

Has the Secretary of State, through private or official channels, received any information from any responsible foreign source as to the attitude the Governments of the belligerent nations, or any of them, might be expected to assume in relation to the transfer to the American flag and American register of merchant ships which have heretofore carried the flag of a belligerent State?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. FLETCHER. I see no objection to the resolution. I think there is no reason why it should not be adopted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

## THE SENATE MANUAL (S. DOC. NO. 938).

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate another resolution coming over from a preceding day, which will be stated.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 535) introduced by Mr. OVERMAN on the 4th instant, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules be instructed to prepare a new edition of the Senate Manual, and that there be printed 4,000 copies of the same for the use of the committee, of which 250 copies shall be bound in full morocco and tagged as to contents.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. GORE. Would the Senator from North Carolina object to an amendment to the resolution providing for the publication of a vest-pocket edition of the rules in convenient form?

Mr. OVERMAN. If it is the desire of the Senate, that can be done. The Constitution has been prepared and is ready to print. We find about 400 errors in this book. The seventeenth amendment is not in it, and some Senators—notably the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN] and the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. HOLLIS]—have never been included in it. It is now brought down to date, and we have the Constitution; and it will be very little trouble, if the Senator desires it, to print a vest-pocket edition of the Constitution, with the citations.

Mr. GORE. And the rules of the Senate? I move that as an amendment.

Mr. OVERMAN. Does the Senator mean the Constitution and the rules of the Senate in a vest-pocket edition?

Mr. GORE. Yes, sir. It will be a very great convenience.

Mr. WILLIAMS. We would have to have it printed on India paper, then.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is unable to state the amendment.

Mr. GORE. I move that the pending resolution be amended by adding:

Provided, That the Committee on Rules is further directed to prepare and print a vest-pocket edition of the rules of the Senate and the Constitution of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. How many copies?

Mr. GORE. I should say a thousand copies.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, the House of Representatives has been printing vest-pocket editions of the platforms, and so forth, and has been sending them to the Senate. I do not know whether or not we ought to return the compliment by sending copies of this edition to the Members of the House. If that be so, it would take more than 250 copies.

Mr. GORE. I would suggest a thousand copies. A thousand would cost very little more than 250.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. BRYAN. I should like to inquire of the chairman of the committee, if it could be done without much trouble, if it would not be well to have declared on the margin of the rules the date upon which each rule was adopted by the Senate?

Mr. OVERMAN. It would be very little trouble, I think, Mr. President.

Mr. BRYAN. It would not require any amendment to the resolution to bring that about.

Mr. OVERMAN. Not at all; just the suggestion from the Senator will be sufficient.

Mr. BRYAN. I make that suggestion to the Senator, because in the construction of a number of the rules very much depends upon when the rule was adopted. For example, the second paragraph of Rule XVI provides that amendments to general appropriation bills moved by members of a standing committee, and so forth, shall be referred to the Committee on Appropriations. It likewise requires amendments proposing new items of appropriation to river and harbor bills to be referred to the Committee on Commerce and amendments to bills establishing post roads or proposing new post roads to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads. Now, it is very possible that at the time this paragraph was adopted those were the only committees outside of the Committee on Appropriations that considered appropriation bills at all. Since then a number of other committees have been empowered to consider appropriation bills; and the question came up and the Vice President was compelled to rule upon it as to whether an amendment to an appropriation bill—for example, where the Committee on Naval Affairs was concerned; I do not remember the committee involved—should go to the Committee on Appropriations or to the committee having charge of the particular appropriation bill. My recollection is that the Chair ruled, and I think correctly, that in all probability this paragraph was amended when there were no other committees except those mentioned in the paragraph that considered appropriation bills, aside from the regular Committee on Appropriations.

If we could have printed in the margin the dates upon which the rules were adopted, it seems to me it would be of great value to every Senator, and it would be very little trouble. The policy followed out in the annotation of compilations of statutes of the States or of the Revised Statutes of the United States could be very easily adopted. I hope the committee will see that that is done, now that we are to have a new edition of the manual.

Mr. OVERMAN. I think it is a very wise suggestion, and I will order it done.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I wish to ask the Senator from North Carolina whether or not he contemplates publishing in this edition the names of Senators elect?

Mr. OVERMAN. That is the purpose of it. There are 17 Senators whose names will have to appear here. Some of them are Senators who are already in the Senate; one, the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN], who was here, I think, last time, but whose name was left out by mistake. That was the purpose.

I want to say that there has been great demand for this book, an unusual demand. Senator Crane introduced an amendment on the 3d day of March two years ago, and it became my duty to look into it. There was the same number of copies printed then, and there are just 10 copies left—only 10—and there is a demand right now for the book. Only yesterday a Member of the House came over and asked for one, so they will soon be exhausted. There are just 10 copies left, and we want to get out the new edition as soon as possible, and we want each new Senator furnished with a copy with his name on it. They are entitled to that.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. BRYAN. There is an additional reason, it seems to me, and a more important reason, for the publication of another edition of the rules, because several amendments have been adopted since this edition was published, and unless Senators happen to remember what those amendments are they can not know what their rights are under the rules and can not know what the rules are. The Vice President has gone to the trouble of having pasted in his copy of the rules those that have been adopted since 1913, but they are not available to the Senate generally.

Mr. OVERMAN. I think it is more important to print it now than ever before. I think there have been more amendments to the rules than ever before. Here is the fifteenth amendment,

and there is no decision relating to the Constitution brought down since volume 225—10 volumes of the reports. Take "due process of law"; there have been many decisions under that head since that time; and, of course, if the Senators want the Constitution, they want it annotated to date.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. WARREN. I entirely agree with the Senator from North Carolina. The resolution ought to pass, and the printing ought to be done, and the book issued at the earliest possible date. If Senators have any copies to spare, I presume there will be calls enough for them. I know in my own case calls for copies from members of legislatures of the States and others interested in parliamentary matters take up all the extra copies I have, and I often have to ask my colleagues for extra copies.

I hope the resolution will pass.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. THOMAS. These rules are printed in the Manual, a copy of which every Senator has. For my part, I do not see any necessity for going to the extra expense of printing them in a different form.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. It is not a different form.

Mr. OVERMAN. No; it is not a different form.

Mr. THOMAS. It is practically in a different form; that is, the rules are printed and bound separately.

Mr. WARREN. Oh, no, Mr. President. It is proposed to reprint them in the same manner.

Mr. OVERMAN. Yes.

Mr. BRYAN. The amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] was defeated.

Mr. THOMAS. Defeated yesterday?

Mr. BRYAN. No; just now.

Mr. THOMAS. I was out of the Chamber.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

#### SHIPS OF BELLIGERENT NATIONS.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BURTON. There was another resolution (S. Res. 527) calling for information which I introduced, directed to the Secretary of the Treasury. I think that ought to come up at the same time with the other resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the rules of the Senate the resolution to which the Senator refers went to the calendar, the morning hour having expired while the resolution was being considered. It can be taken from the calendar only on motion or by unanimous consent.

Mr. BURTON. I ask unanimous consent that it be considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Ohio asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution mentioned by him.

Mr. KERN. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. KERN. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] is necessarily absent from the Chamber, and I think I shall have to object in his absence. I understand that he objects to its consideration.

Mr. BURTON. Do I understand that there is objection because of the absence of the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. KERN. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is made. Morning business is closed.

#### THE MERCHANT MARINE.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, on yesterday, before I suspended my remarks, I had referred to the fact that at the first conference of Democratic Senators during the present session of Congress there was a general agreement that the policy of Democratic Senators during this session should be, first, to pass the necessary supply bills, and then, after that work was accomplished, if time remained, to devote it to the legislative program suggested by the President.

Because I made that suggestion a statement has been made in the public press to the effect that some caucus secret had been disclosed. Unless my memory is very much at fault, the reverse is true. Following the practice of the conference, at its adjournment the Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN], who presided at that conference, gave a brief statement to the press stating what I have already stated on the floor of the Senate as the action of the conference.

I refer again to that action by the Democratic conference for this reason: To indicate to the Senate what the deliberate and unanimous judgment of Democratic Senators who were experienced in legislation and acquainted with the rules of this body was as to what it was possible to accomplish during this session of the Congress, and how, uninfluenced from any other quarter or by anybody else, the position they then took was, in my judgment, the sound position, the one that the country expects of us—that we should first of all and certainly pass the great supply bills that are necessary to run this Government, and then, after that necessary work was done, should go home and give the people some time to digest the great constructive legislation that we have been passing since the Democratic Party came into power.

I believed that such a course was for the best interests of the Democratic Party and of the country alike; and at that time, unless I am sadly in error in my memory, not a single Democratic Member in this Chamber raised his voice in opposition to that idea.

Mr. President, reference has been made by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] to the caucus—you will observe I no longer say "conference"—resolution adopted on the 15th day of December, 1903, by the gentlemen who were then Democratic Senators from the various States of the Union. I want to read it again so that this body may catch the exact and accurate import of that resolution. It reads:

*Resolved, That hereafter all members of the Senate Democratic caucus shall be bound to vote in accordance with its decisions made by a two-thirds vote of all its members on all questions except those involving a construction of the Constitution, or upon which a Senator has made pledges to his constituents, or received instructions from the legislature of the State he represents.*

This resolution, of course, was adopted before the constitutional amendment relating to the manner and mode of electing Senators had been agreed to, hence the last clause.

Mr. President, it will be observed that there are at least two classes of cases in which express provision is made that no Democratic Senator shall be bound, even by the vote of a caucus, when two-thirds of the members of his party assent thereto: First, upon all questions relating to the Constitution. Why? Because we are patriots, I hope, before we are partisans; and for the further reason that every Member of this body has sworn to support and defend the Constitution of the United States, and no man can be constrained to violate his oath of office.

In reference to the pending bill, there are Senators on this side, myself included, who have at least grave doubts as to the constitutionality of this measure. I do not profess positive conviction, because I have not yet fully matured my convictions on this subject; but I do express the gravest doubt as to the constitutional power of the Government of the United States to enact this legislation. Not long ago, on this floor, during the progress of this debate, I witnessed a spectacle and heard a colloquy that was amazing to me. Some Senator—I do not wish to call names now—sitting on the other side of the Chamber asked one of the distinguished Senators in charge of this bill, a Senator for whom I have the highest personal regard, and who has had long and distinguished service in this body, this question: "Upon what constitutional power do you rest this legislation?" The reply was made from the Senator on this side—the Democratic side, forsooth, of this Chamber—"The general-welfare clause of the Constitution."

Then the rejoinder came with crushing force, and it was deserved, that the Senator was the first Democrat who had ever lived to get to the Senate of the United States who gave such an answer like that to a question like that. The rejoinder was, "Well, if we can enact one bill because we believe or contend that it is for the general welfare of the people of the United States, we can enact all bills that we believe to be for the general welfare of the people of the United States," and what then becomes of the ancient Democratic, yea, the ancient American doctrine, that this is a Government of delegated powers, and that this Federal Government of ours may not exercise any power save that which is expressly conferred upon it or may be necessarily implied from the express powers?

So to me at least, young as I am in years, although somewhat old-fashioned, I admit, in my Democratic beliefs, the rejoinder upon the other side of this Chamber was not only crushing but complete, and I do not believe that in the future we are likely to hear any Senator of the United States, on this side of the Chamber at least, say that he rests legislation on the general-welfare clause of the Constitution. Certainly I could never rest my vote for any legislation on the general-welfare clause.

What other power, then, of the Constitution can be invoked as the basis of this legislation? Has not the Government the power to construct and maintain a Navy? Ah, Senators, that is

true, but as this bill is worded, when we consider its history, when we consider the current events that are transpiring, when we consider the arguments that are made for it, when we consider the language in which it is phrased, when we consider the provisions of the measure itself, it is impossible to deny that that contention is little more than a subterfuge. There are a great many very able writers on this question who contend, and contend with some degree of force, according to the way I look at it, that in this age of specialization, when vessels, as well as other things, are specialized, the type of ship best adapted for auxiliary purposes in the Navy is not the type of ship that you need for commercial purposes; and the contention is not disguised, yea, it is vociferously urged on this floor, that what we really want in respect to this matter is ships for commercial purposes.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. That is what the bill says.

Mr. HARDWICK. The bill says that, as my friend from Utah suggests.

Now, one other thought. If this bill is to provide ships for the real purpose of giving us an auxiliary for the American Navy, and that is not a mere subterfuge, a mere incident, why is that in no draft of the bill? During the many different revelations that we have had on this great question nobody has proposed that the Secretary of the Navy or anyone representing that department of the Government shall have a voice in the matter or representation on this board, with a view to determining that ships of a character suitable for naval purposes shall be either purchased or built under the operation of this measure.

Can the pending bill rest on the power to regulate interstate and foreign commerce? I not only doubt that proposition, but I flatly deny it. The power to regulate either interstate or foreign commerce does not include in it the power to engage in such commerce. I do not care to argue that proposition further than to state it. It seems to me like a construction that contends because the Constitution of the United States authorizes the Congress of the United States to regulate commerce between the several States and with Indian tribes and among foreign nations, therefore it authorizes the Government of the United States to go into the business on its own hook and for itself in those kinds of commerce, is far-fetched and untenable.

If that be sound, then I ask my Democratic friends what becomes of your doctrine of a government of limited powers, of a government of constitutional limitations? The commerce clause of the Constitution already is the vehicle of almost every encroachment of Federal power upon the reserved rights of the States of this great Republic, and if you are going to give it that construction both as to the interstate-commerce clause and the foreign-commerce clause you had just as well wipe out your State lines and abandon your dual system of government and forswear all allegiance to the principles of local self-government that you have prated about for generations.

Mr. President, there is another kind and character of cases in which the caucus resolution itself expressly provides for exemption from its operation. Senators who can bring themselves within its terms are bound on all questions except those involving a construction of the Constitution or upon which a Senator has made pledges to his constituents.

Speaking for myself alone, I fling it back into the very teeth of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] that his denunciation of my conduct is as unjust and unjustifiable a proceeding as was ever heard upon this floor as between two Senators who belong to the same party, or even to different parties, for that matter. In the campaign that I made in the State of Georgia for the Democratic nomination for the Senate, which finally, of course, resulted in my election to this body, I pledged to the people of Georgia in almost every one of about 200 speeches which I made in that great Commonwealth—I stated to them rather, because I did not put it in the form of a pledge—my unalterable opposition to any form, kind, shape, or fashion of Government ownership of transportation facilities.

It is true this shipping bill was not mentioned because, as far as I know, it was not pending then. It certainly was not being generally discussed then. Nobody in Georgia at least was considering it. I got into that position because one of the distinguished and able gentlemen who were my competitors for that nomination insisted that I occupied a reactionary position, because I had been unwilling to agree to an extension of the weight limit and of the distance zone of the Parcel Post System. I met that attack by stating frankly that I had been opposed even to going as far as we had gone, that I would not under any circumstances go one inch farther in that direction, because if we were to go into the business of transporting freight for hire it meant necessarily and inevitably the Government ownership and operation of transportation facilities which must

carry that freight. To that form of government activity I avowed in almost every county of my beloved Commonwealth my unalterable opposition.

Now, I appeal to my colleagues who have been inclined to criticize my conduct, while I am new in the service here, I can accept no man's judgment upon what my position shall be, but I want them to consider the position in which I find myself. I had rather be a Senator of the United States from the great State of Georgia for three weeks, my own man, and voting my own convictions, than to be here for three decades somebody else's man and voicing somebody else's convictions.

What am I to do? What ought I to have done? Could I tell the people of Georgia in the very campaign that resulted in my election that I was opposed to this form of governmental activity and then embrace it before the echoes of the campaign have died away? I can not. I will not. No 38 men, no 38,000,000 men can make me do it; and if I understand the genius of democratic institutions and the rules of the Democratic Party in this House and in the other House, too, there is no rule of any caucus that attempts to do it.

Mr. President, it is also true, for the purpose of enabling any gentleman who wants to criticize me here or elsewhere to have his full and fair opportunity to do so. I say now in that same campaign in Georgia I did proclaim in a general way my devotion to the great Democrat who sits in the White House at present. And let me pause right here long enough to say that while I differ from him on this question honestly and conscientiously, because I am bound to do it as a matter of conscience unless I stultify my own mentality, yet I regard him as the greatest Democrat who has ever lived in this land since the days of Thomas Jefferson. He is not perfect; he is not infallible. I do not think Jefferson was that; no mortal man has ever been. I simply can not agree with him about this question, because my judgment, my mind, and my conscience do not lead me in the same way that this bill leads.

In a general way the people of Georgia understood that I hoped to have the privilege and pleasure of supporting that great Democrat in this administration. So I shall, but not upon a matter about which my express and explicit declaration is expressly and explicitly to the contrary.

Furthermore, I took occasion in that contest—and then I will pass from these localisms; they can not entertain the Senate, and they weary me; I simply do it in order that I may state my own case as briefly as may be—I took occasion in that campaign to say, while expressing my admiration for this great Democrat, of the great work he had helped us to do here, that on certain questions I had already disagreed with President Wilson, and one question particularly that I proposed never to allow a certain thing he was suspected of wanting to do to be done in this Chamber, unless the rules of the Senate were changed or I was carried from this floor feet foremost first. So any fair construction of friend or foe in my own State or elsewhere can not mean that I was pledged to slavish agreement with the President of the United States or with anybody else. I would not willingly serve here a single day on such degrading terms.

Now, Mr. President, passing on to certain other general matters connected with this matter, there are one or two more exceptions from the operations of this caucus rule that, while they are not expressed, are, in my judgment, necessarily and unavoidably implied. First of all, I do not think that any one of my Democratic brethren would contend, and certainly if they did so contend I know that no considerable body of men anywhere in this Republic would sustain them in that contention, that the caucus can or would undertake to bind men in matters of conscience, to bind men to do things that they themselves honestly believed were wrong. I do not think it has ever undertaken to do that, and I do not believe any member of it would contend that it possessed such an authority.

Furthermore, I lay down the proposition as sound for my own party and sound for any party, and as sound for the Republic and as absolutely necessary for the independence and dignity and power of this great body, that there is one other exception to this rule that all parties must observe unless they want to get into trouble just like the present one. And what is that? By mere caucus dictum, by mere caucus action, no party ought to attempt to make a matter that is not declared party policy or principle a party matter. Whenever it is undertaken, woe for that party that makes the effort to do it, unless its virility is gone, unless the fires of independence have died out of the heart of its sons.

And yet that very course has been adopted here in respect to this matter. Pardon me in this connection if I venture to bring to my support on that great question the recent conduct and the recent words of the distinguished President of the United

States. Only a day or so ago he found occasion to disagree with more than two-thirds of his associates in this body and with almost two-thirds of his Democratic associates at the other end of the Capitol. It was about a matter that there was no Democratic platform declaration—upon the literacy test of the immigration bill. President Wilson used this language:

If the people of this country have made up their minds to limit the number of immigrants by arbitrary tests and so reverse the policy of all the generations of Americans that have gone before them, it is their right to do so. I am their servant and have no license to stand in their way. But I do not believe that they have. I respectfully submit that no one can quote their mandate to that effect. Has any political party ever avowed a policy of restriction in this fundamental matter, gone to the country on it, and been commissioned to control its legislation? Does this bill rest upon the conscious and universal assent and desire of the American people? I doubt it. It is because I doubt it that I make bold to dissent from it.

Gentlemen, I am on the other side of that question from the President of the United States, and, by the way, I so stated in my campaign, and yet, while I should willingly have voted to have overridden that veto if I had had the opportunity, I have not in my heart or head the slightest criticism for the manly way in which the President has exercised his undoubted right and has discharged his duty as he sees it.

But it is to be observed in this connection, first, that the President of the United States takes to himself the right to differ from a vast majority of his party associates and colleagues in the two Houses of Congress upon a matter, because it is not a matter of declared party policy or principle.

Second. That the President of the United States exercises an undoubted right—and his bold exercise of it is one of the things that makes him a great man—and exercises his own mental independence to dissent from his colleagues on this immigration bill. All right. But I want to inquire of the American people and of the American Senate, Has the day yet arrived when a Senator of the United States has less right to independence about legislation that he must vote upon than the President has about vetoing it? Must a Senator be constrained on a matter that is not a matter of declared party policy and principle when the President refuses to be so constrained? Must the "teamwork" be all on one side, or is the "teamwork" to be reciprocal?

Senators, I do not believe that the President of the United States has any desire to be autocratic. I could not have honestly and truthfully said of him what I said just now, that I regard him as the greatest Democrat since Thomas Jefferson, if I thought that or if I believed that. In the past I have had occasion to differ from him vitally on important questions. Never yet have I seen him either intolerant or unjust. Surely, Senators, we have not a Democratic President in the White House to-day who claims to exercise for himself rights that he undertakes or that his friends undertake to deny to Senators of the United States who belong to his own party.

This shipping bill is not a matter of declared party precedent or policy according to the tenets of Democratic faith, and I believe I can demonstrate that. It contradicts every declaration of Democratic faith on the subject in many years. If so, I wish to ask what 40 men in this body or in all this American Republic who are for it, or 40,000, for that matter, can bind Democrats to vote for it? If we had a solemn conference or a caucus—I do not care which—over the tariff question, and some Democratic Senator formally and eloquently presented a resolution that the Committee on Finance of the Senate be instructed to construct a tariff bill along protective-tariff lines it would not be binding on me—not for one-half a second. I will suggest that. You can not bind me to do that sort of thing. Of course it would not be done, but I am illustrating and taking an extreme case to illustrate with.

I want, first, to read from the national platform of the Democratic Party of 1890. We made this declaration on the shipping question then:

Free ships and a living chance for American commerce on the seas and on the land.

Our record, then declared and published to the world, was for free ships; the removal of tariff duties so that ships might be built on American soil by American builders as cheaply as they could be built on foreign soil by foreign builders.

Again, in 1884 the Democratic Party made this declaration; it is more of an oration at that time, it happens, in regard to the matter, but I will read it, because it sounds good to me:

Under a long period of Democratic rule and policy our merchant marine was fast overtaking and on the point of outstripping that of Great Britain. Under 20 years of Republican rule and policy our commerce has been left to British bottoms, and the American flag has almost been swept off the high seas. Instead of the Republican Party's British policy, we demand for the people of the United States an American policy. Under Democratic rule and policy our merchants and sailors, flying the Stars and Stripes in every port, successfully searched out a market for the varied products of American industry; under a

quarter of a century of Republican rule and policy—despite our manifest advantage over all other nations in high-paid labor, favorable climate, and teeming soils; despite freedom of trade among all these United States; despite their population by the foremost races of men, and an annual immigration of the young, thrifty, and adventurous of all nations; despite our freedom here from the inherited burdens of life and industry in the Old World monarchies, their costly war navies, their vast tax-consuming, nonproducing standing armies; despite 20 years of peace—that Republican rule and policy have managed to surrender to Great Britain, along with our commerce, the control of the markets of the world. Instead of the Republican Party's British policy, we demand, in behalf of the American Democracy, an American policy. Instead of the Republican Party's discredited scheme and false pretense of friendship for American labor, expressed by imposing taxes, we demand in behalf of the Democracy freedom for American labor, by reducing taxes, to the end that these United States may compete with unhindered powers for the primacy among nations in all the arts of peace and fruits of liberty.

So your party declaration went in the year of grace 1884, when we first elected Grover Cleveland, the first Democratic President after the Civil War. In 1888, in 1892, in 1896, and in 1900 there seemed to have been no declarations of any party policy or principle in regard to this matter; but beginning with the year 1904, when Judge Parker, of New York, was our candidate for President, we find this subject again recurring in Democratic platforms. I read next, Mr. President, from the Democratic platform of the year 1904. In that year we said this:

We favor the upbuilding of a merchant marine without new or additional burdens upon the people and without bounties from the Public Treasury.

In 1908 we repeated that language, except that we said "we believe in" instead of saying "we favor."

In 1912—the last campaign, the one which resulted in President Wilson's election—we used this language:

We believe in fostering, by constitutional regulation—

Were those words put there for nothing? It seems to me as though in this present moment and in its full light they have a significant and powerful meaning.

#### MERCHANT MARINE.

We believe in fostering, by constitutional regulation of commerce, the growth of a merchant marine, which shall develop and strengthen the commercial ties which bind us to our sister Republics of the south, but without imposing additional burdens upon the people and without bounties or subsidies from the Public Treasury.

Ah, Senators, I told you just now that, as I regarded my own circumstances, I was pledged specifically to the people of Georgia against Government ownership of almost every kind. I tell you now that, in my honest judgment, taking this platform as it is written and giving it a thorough and just construction, every Democratic Senator who has been elected since its adoption or who concurred in its sentiments in the campaign in which it was promulgated is likewise bound not to support any proposition to build an American merchant marine by bounties or out of the Public Treasury. And yet the pending bill proposes to build these ships entirely out of the Public Treasury and at the expense of the taxpayers. And yet some of our colleagues say that we who favor recommitment are recreant to Democratic faith because we do not take their judgment in this matter, which is either not a declared matter of party principle or policy, or, so far as we can fairly and reasonably judge from what has been declared, is in the teeth of every platform that the national Democracy of this great Republic has ever written. Instead of being the "new freedom" it is the "new departure," and for one I am unwilling to take it.

Senators, in the beginning—and I have enough faith and confidence in the President to believe it is so even yet—the President occupied a position on this particular measure that was not incompatible with the ancient Democratic faith nor with the declared principles and policies of our party on this great question. In the beginning President Wilson insisted—and, so far as I now know or have a right to say, he still insists, in spite of the action of this body or of any Democratic conference of this body—that this was to be a temporary measure. I can prove that to you not only from the address that he made to the Congress of the United States when Congress assembled in December last, but also from the recent speech that he made in the city of Indianapolis on the 8th day of last January.

Referring to this bill, which was then pending in the House of Representatives, not yet incubated in this august body, the President of the United States used this language on the 8th day of December last, when he addressed the two Houses of Congress in joint session assembled:

Hence the pending shipping bill, discussed at the last session but as yet—

And I emphasize the words "as yet"—

passed by neither House. In my judgment such legislation is imperatively needed and can not wisely be postponed. The Government must open these gates of trade, and open them wide.

Senators, if you will pardon me an aside for just a moment, the "gates of trade" to which the President referred on the

8th of December were the "gates of trade" between this country and South America. Now, it seems that for political reasons it is contended in this body that the "gates of trade" which it is desired to open are those between this country and Europe, in order to ship our cotton and grain and products of that kind, so as to put the impelling force of the people who think they will get something out of it behind this measure.

The Government must open these gates of trade, and open them wide; open them before it is altogether profitable to open them, or altogether reasonable to ask private capital to open them at a venture. It is not a question of the Government monopolizing the field. It should take action to make it certain that transportation at reasonable rates will be promptly provided, even where the carriage is not at first profitable—

Now, mark this language, Senators, particularly—

and then, when the carriage has become sufficiently profitable to attract and engage private capital, and engage it in abundance, the Government ought to withdraw.

Showing that the great President of the United States himself recognized the soundness of the Democratic position I have taken to-day on this floor and that has been enunciated in many national declarations of our party, and was urging this as a temporary war measure to meet an abnormal situation for a brief period of time until normal conditions should return.

Not only that, but in his speech at Indianapolis, delivered on the 8th day of January, the anniversary of Jackson's victory at New Orleans, in discussing the shipping bill, the President of the United States used these words to his audience:

Do you know, gentlemen, that the ocean freight rates have gone up in some instances to ten times their ordinary figure, and that the farmers of the United States—those who raise grain and those who raise cotton, these things that are absolutely necessary to the world as well as to ourselves—can not get any profit out of the great prices that they are willing to pay for these things on the other side of the sea because the whole profit is eaten up by the extortionate charges for ocean carriage? In the midst of this the Democrats propose a temporary measure of relief in a shipping bill.

Sensors, I have the shipping bill before me, the last substitute offered on this floor by the distinguished and able Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER], and I defy any Senator in charge of this bill, or any other Senator on this floor—and I gladly invite interruption on this point—to show me anything in it which makes this a temporary measure by its terms as written. On the contrary, I want to read you some provisions to indicate that, so far as this bill is concerned, it is a permanent departure that we are engaged in if we vote for this bill in its present form and shape. I read now from the last substitute presented by the Senator from Florida:

SEC. 7. That, with the approval of the Congress, such shipping board may at any time sell the stock of such corporation owned by the United States.

In other words, until Congress passes a law repealing this measure, it is to remain in force forever and ever, and unless Congress at some future date does pass a law repealing this measure, then it is to be of full force and effect forever and a day. Again:

SEC. 10. That the shipping board shall make to Congress, at the beginning of each regular session, a report—

And so forth.

Ah, gentlemen, the President of the United States, recognizing the true and ancient Democratic faith, but insisting that a great emergency had arisen in which normal rules could not be applied and normal principles could not be strictly adhered to, asks you to give to the people of this country a temporary measure to meet a great war emergency. Yet you have given us a bill that, so far as the law itself is concerned, is permanent and perpetual in its operation and is in conflict with every tenet of Democratic faith from Jefferson's day to this. You did not do it in the way and put it on the ground that the President of the United States insisted upon—that it was a great war emergency measure to meet an abnormal condition, an enterprise which was to be abandoned as soon as the normality of the situation could be restored.

So I say that as this bill now stands it is not in accordance with what the President of the United States recommended and urged upon the Congress of the United States or upon the people of the United States; it is not in accordance with Democratic faith, and we can not justify it upon that basis; and men who feel as I do, and who are pledged as I am, and who entertain the convictions of a lifetime as I do on this subject, can not and will not do it; that is all.

Not only that, but to make it worse, piling Pelion upon Ossa in this matter, I propose to show now that this Democratic caucus that denounces seven of us for standing true to the faith of the fathers and standing even by the President himself upon the proposition of whether or not this measure shall be temporary, voted down a proposition calculated and intended to make this measure a temporary one. It was when I learned of

that action, when I saw that purpose written into words and expressed in the bill, and heard that they had denied the proposition that this measure should be made temporary in its character and in its duration, I made up my mind that, as a Democrat who had been nurtured in the school of the ancient faith and as a man who had made the pledges and declarations to his constituency that I have made, I could not, without self-stultification, support the bill in such a form, permanent and epoch making instead of temporary.

I trust I will not be considered as having referred improperly to conference secrets or caucus secrets when I mention the fact that my own distinguished colleague from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] offered this proposition. It was overwhelmingly voted down. I got the information from the press, for, because I long had feared that this bill might evolve from that caucus in such a shape that I could not support it, I had not felt at liberty to continue to attend a conference whose work I might not be able to uphold. My colleague, however, offered this amendment, and if I may judge from the public press and from the references made to it here on the floor by Democratic Senators and one Republican Senator, it was overwhelmingly defeated.

I have a great many doubts on the practical and business aspects of this question, but I say frankly that they are not such doubts as would cause me, standing alone and by themselves, except on possibly one question, to venture to dissent at so early a period in my service from the judgment of a vast majority of my colleagues; and yet, when added to the other objections that I have, they may have to some extent influenced my judgment and position about this matter.

If I support this bill at all—and I should like to do it if the necessity for it is as great as is contended, and I should like to do it in order to live and dwell in harmony, so far as my convictions will permit me, with my party associates here and elsewhere—it has to be a temporary measure; and if it is a temporary measure, if that is what it means, if we are standing on President Wilson's message to the Congress on this subject or on his Indianapolis speech, either or both, let me ask, Is it a practical proposition as a temporary question?

If we pass this bill we have got either to build these ships or to buy them. If we buy them, unless we are going to pay extortionate prices, where will we get them except from the belligerent powers? I have no doubt that we could make fairly reasonable trades for these interned German vessels; but, for one, I must confess that I would never, under present circumstances, vote to give to any shipping board on this earth a power that might involve us in grave international troubles and that might lead us into the most ruinous war that we have ever had.

Sometimes I think, when I look at the desolate condition of the South, that about the only blessing we have left down there at the present moment is peace; and I am not going to surrender its safeguarding to any board on this earth, whether made up of Cabinet officers or otherwise. I am not going by my vote to give them the chance or the possibility to do something which I believe, in all probability, will lead us into international complications so grave as to precipitate a great war upon this country.

Well, if we are not going to buy the German ships, the interned vessels—and that seems to be pretty generally conceded now—where are we going to buy them? If the freight rates are as high as the proponents of this bill insist when they urge it, the proposition on which they started on December 8 of last year is unsound, because private capital is then reaping the richest harvest it has ever reaped since the beginning of time in this sort of venture; and if that be true, what man with a ship that can make its value on almost every voyage it takes will sell it unless he gets a value proportionate to the profits he would now make if he retains it? Therefore, unless the Government is to buy either a war or a gold brick, it will buy no ships.

How, then, are we to get them? Of course there is one other way to get them. We might build them. I made some investigation of that subject. The contentions vary as to the length of time it will take to build ships. I will take a 7,500-ton ship as a standard. The contentions as to how long it would take to build such a ship vary from 6 months, as suggested by the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER], to about 18 months, if my memory serves me correctly, as suggested by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON]. If the truth lies between these two extremes, as it usually does, and is somewhere or other about halfway between them, it would take probably about 12 months at least to construct these ships and get them ready to operate, and by that time, in all human probability, I believe—I hope, at least—this great war will be over, and then, before you can get this temporary expedient rigged up, the necessity for it will pass.

Mr. President, there have been various statements made, with more or less temper and acerbity, about the conduct and position of myself and other Senators who have ventured, have dared, on this question to stand squarely, four-footed on our own feet and do what we thought was right. We have been assailed in and out of this Chamber by men who ought to have more self-respect than to condemn us for venturing to have a soul that each of us calls his own. Ah, Senators, think on what slender ground this condemnation, this judgment of conduct, rests. All that we have done in this matter so far is to say that we think this bill ought to be recommitted. We have no agreement, no understanding, no sort of contract, express or implied, with anybody on this earth except to recommit this bill to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. HARDWICK. I do; yes.

Mr. THOMAS. If it will not interrupt the Senator, I should like to ask him a question.

Mr. HARDWICK. Not at all.

Mr. THOMAS. Does the Senator believe, if this bill is recommitted, that there is any probability whatever of its being reported back to the Senate during this session?

Mr. HARDWICK. I will answer the Senator frankly. Of course he understands that I answer absolutely and only for myself.

Mr. THOMAS. Certainly.

Mr. HARDWICK. I can answer for no one except myself. I can tell the Senator what I know, so far as I am concerned, and what I believe—that if this bill is recommitted to the Committee on Commerce and the Committee on Commerce amends it, as I believe it will amend it, so as to make the measure a temporary measure to meet a great and abnormal war situation, as the President recommended and urged, and so that it contains also a provision that no shipping board shall be allowed to purchase interned ships without the consent of the opposite belligerent powers, so that we may not involve this country in a war, then I believe the bill will be promptly re-reported and, as far as I am concerned, will be passed. With these amendments I could support it.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia further yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. HARDWICK. I yield, of course.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator says that if the bill is reported back and if certain amendments are made he believes it will be passed. He, of course, is more familiar than I with the purposes of those members of the Committee on Commerce with whom—

Mr. HARDWICK. Will the Senator pardon me for just a moment? Let me interrupt the Senator. I notice that the public press of New York contains a statement substantially like that from the junior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN], who entertains practically the views that I do on this question. I mention that merely as corroborating the answer I have given.

Mr. THOMAS. Can the Senator inform us, upon the assumption that the bill will be amended and reported back, why the Republican minority has taken this method of getting rid of the bill?

Mr. HARDWICK. I will ask the Senator, in answer to that question, to inform me why certain Republican Senators are reported to have entered into a compact with the majority in order to amend a so-called Democratic bill?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I will answer that question, so far as I can, by saying that I do not know that this is the situation.

Mr. HARDWICK. I will ask the Senator another question, then. Does the Senator know whether the Democratic caucus appointed a committee of Senators to see how many Republican votes they could secure for this bill by making concessions to Republicans?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I will be equally frank. A committee was appointed such as the Senator mentions—

Mr. HARDWICK. For that purpose?

Mr. THOMAS. To confer with Senators upon the other side whose objections to this bill were said not to be fundamental except as it is now framed, but who would be perfectly satisfied with a bill containing some modifications, and whose opinions have never been concealed, but have been openly expressed by one of them at least upon this floor, a situation made necessary by the present attitude of the Senator and his associates.

Mr. HARDWICK. Very well. The Senator and I understand each other very well, and I think the Senate and the country

understand the situation. There are certain Democrats here who are not willing to vote for this bill without amendment and are not going to do it, and there is not enough power in the United States to make them do it.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia further yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. HARDWICK. I do.

Mr. THOMAS. I do not doubt the word of the Senator, because he has stated his position very clearly and very positively several times—that he does not intend to and will not vote for the measure.

Mr. HARDWICK. As now framed, if the Senator will pardon me.

Mr. THOMAS. As now framed. It is that circumstance which has made it necessary to meet and appoint committees to see what, under the circumstances, can be done with other Senators, and which I hope will be done, for the purpose of making this bill effectual.

Mr. HARDWICK. Of course, Mr. President, I can understand full well why the Senator from Colorado feels that way. I have the highest public and private regard for the Senator, and yet, from his speech yesterday, I find myself as far away from him as the South Pole is from the North Pole. The Senator avowed that he was fast becoming a convert to this new idea of Government ownership; that he at first looked upon it with alarm, then with complacency, and was now about to embrace it.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia further yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. HARDWICK. I do.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator is always frank, and I have no doubt about the positiveness of his convictions. It is true that upon this and perhaps some other matters of public concern we are wide asunder. The fact is equally true over there.

Mr. HARDWICK. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMAS. It simply shows that party organizations at present are held together by the force of party tradition. It simply means that public opinion and party organizations are in flux. I trust the time will soon come when the forces of political gravitation will bring about an alignment which sooner or later is inevitable, since divergence of opinion between the units of parties as they are now organized necessarily means difference, and difference means party dissension. These conditions will bring about a new alignment, and then of course these situations can be met and disposed of, as they should be, by men working in harmony who are now divided by party names.

Mr. HARDWICK. The observation of the Senator from Colorado but confirms the argument I made at an earlier stage of this address against the senseless and futile attempt to make a party question of a matter that is not a party question, and about which men in the same party entertain honest and deep-seated and fundamental differences of opinion.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia further yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. HARDWICK. I do.

Mr. THOMAS. If there is a single question of national importance upon which Republicans, so called, or Democrats, so called, are a unit, I do not know what it is. We are on this side of the Chamber because we call ourselves Democrats. Senators on the other side of the Chamber are there because they call themselves Republicans. I venture the assertion that there is not, and for the past 10 years has not been, a question of overshadowing public importance upon which the members of these two great organizations have been a unit upon either side of it.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, I want to submit now for the consideration of my distinguished friend from Colorado, and of certain other Senators on this side who have busied themselves about this matter, this question: Why are you so willing to trade, even on the contents of the measure itself, with Republicans rather than with your own associates, who are demanding no more of you than the President of the United States requested of us all?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, without conceding the last remark to be correct, we are doing so because of the position which the Senator has announced so positively, that we can not under any circumstances longer agree upon our own side of the Chamber, and in his own case I meet the question by repeating it and ask whether it was not necessary for the Senator to make the arrangements they evidently have made with the other side because of his objections?

Mr. HARDWICK. I will answer that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 6856) to authorize the United States, acting through a shipping board, to subscribe to the capital stock of a corporation, to be organized under the laws of the United States or of a State thereof or of the District of Columbia, to purchase, construct, equip, maintain, and operate merchant vessels in the foreign trade of the United States, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia will continue.

Mr. HARDWICK. Now, in the subsequent part of my remarks I wish to refer again to the difference between my friend from Colorado and myself. To the charge, certainly as far as I am concerned, that I have bolted the Democratic Party, I answer that it is untrue.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I have not made that charge.

Mr. HARDWICK. Not expressly. I am not alluding to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. THOMAS. I should very greatly deplore the fact if it were true.

Mr. HARDWICK. The Senator knows it is not true. It is untrue. Under the express rules of the caucus itself, I have not been bound to support this measure from the beginning, but the charge that we did not advise Democrats on this side whom we knew were opposed to this motion to recommit of the fact that it was about to be made, I answer that it is manifestly foolish to expect sensible, practical men who want to adopt a motion to recommit or any other parliamentary motion in any legislative body to go to the enemies of the particular proposition they have in mind for support when they know in advance that they can not get it under any circumstances. The Senator knows, of course, full well, as all his associates do, that in the Democratic caucus we made repeated demands and repeated pleas for these things that we now ask publicly before the Senate and before the people of the United States.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEA of Tennessee in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. HARDWICK. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. I was present at the Democratic caucus all the time the Senator was there, and I do not recall that the Senator made any repeated demands or repeated appeals or repeated arguments along the line he now presents.

Mr. HARDWICK. If the Senator from Maryland will do me the honor to read in the Record in the morning my exact language, he will see that I did not claim I did it myself. Being a young and modest member of the caucus and of the Senate, I left most of the talking to others. But I want to say this to the Senator: I stayed in the caucus until I became convinced that it was no longer a free conference, such as Democrats have been holding in this body for, lo, these many years, and that an attempt to gag and blind me was against my convictions. I discovered you were not going to follow the path your President and mine had pointed out to both of us, and that you were going to make this measure permanent instead of temporary, as he had urged. I stayed in caucus until I became convinced that if I should support the measure as the caucus proposed and framed it I would stultify my mentality in the matter and violate my pledges to my own constituency.

Mr. THOMAS. I wish to ask the Senator if he gave to his associates knowledge of the fact that he was going to leave the caucus?

Mr. HARDWICK. If the Senator will pardon me, I am just about to come to that very point. The Senator's interruption is timely. When I discovered what the situation was and what the result of this conference in all probability would be I conferred with my distinguished colleague from my own State, advising him of my conviction and of my views, and I requested him to inform the caucus—and I have been informed since that he informed the caucus—of my position and state that the measure as originally framed would not, unless amended, receive my support, owing to the pledges I had made to my own constituency.

Now, referring once more to the charge, disingenuous and insincere, of secret dealing, of conspiracy, if you please, that the distinguished diplomatic and wise Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE]—I am sorry he is not here—ventured to make on this floor against certain of his Democratic associates; if we conferred with certain Republican Members of this body to find out whether or not they intended to support this motion if made, we did so, as I said just now, without committing our-

selves to the defeat of this bill in any form, without committing ourselves to vote for or against any amendment. If we conferred, we had a distinguished example. We had distinguished company. Before this time Senators in this Chamber and the Chief Executives of both parties have not hesitated to confer with Senators of the opposite party about various legislative matters. In this particular matter the Senate Democratic conference appointed a committee of three, if I may believe the public press, to confer with Republican Senators. A committee of three, consisting of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS], were appointed to confer. To confer with whom? To confer with their Democratic associates who had troubles about the bill in its present form, but might be able to support it if concessions were made to them? Not primarily, at least, but to confer with certain distinguished Senators on the other side of the aisle, to go to them with hands up and say, "Help us, Cassius, or we sink. What do you want? What do you demand? What is your price? We will let Republican Senators really write this bill rather than to concede to our own colleagues, who base their stand on Democratic principles and Democratic doctrine as old as the fathers of this Republic." You conferred with them. You did this because we, forsooth, did not like the way they acted about this matter, because we found Democratic principle and precedent set at naught. We were ignored, and they said, "We will go to the Republicans and let them write this bill."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. HARDWICK. I do, with pleasure.

Mr. THOMAS. I think it only fair that the Senator should state that the committee to which he has just referred was instructed first to confer with him and his associates.

Mr. HARDWICK. I thought it was the other way. I am glad the Senator has advised me to the contrary.

Mr. THOMAS. And we consented to an adjournment of 24 hours at the request of the President pro tempore of the Senate for that purpose, but our intended negotiations, as we feared, proved abortive.

Mr. HARDWICK. If it will not embarrass the Senator and he will not object, let me ask him this question: Were the same Senators who were instructed to confer with these Senators also instructed to confer with the Republicans?

Mr. THOMAS. Oh, yes, Mr. President. We apprehended, as the situation afterwards proved, that the attempt which the Senator says we should have made would prove, as it did prove, disappointing.

Mr. HARDWICK. It was the very reverse, with all deference to my friend.

Mr. THOMAS. I do not think I am mistaken. If I am, I stand corrected.

Mr. HARDWICK. I do not mean to question the fact, but I am simply stating what I heard. The very reverse, as I understand it, is the true situation. On the question of appointing the same committee at one and the same time to confer about the bill reaching this way and that way I will not characterize it. It was not very respectful nor appropriate.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield further to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. HARDWICK. I do.

Mr. THOMAS. If the Senator and his associates had only let us know in advance that his idea of the ceremony to be observed would have been the appointment of two separate committees, then we would have done it in the caucus. If that is the objection which caused them to refuse to accede to our request, we will appoint a separate committee now.

Mr. HARDWICK. Oh, no. That is a mere matter of taste. De gustibus non est disputandum. There is nothing further to say about it.

But the proposition that we declined to consider anything I can not allow to go unchallenged. What we did do was this: We asked the committee to agree to the motion to recommit, and further we explained the views we had and the amendments we would like to have made. We discussed that with our associates with candor and with some fullness.

Mr. THOMAS. I think that is correct, Mr. President. There is no difference between us.

Mr. HARDWICK. All right. I am glad we are at last together on one point.

Mr. THOMAS. We are together on that proposition, but if the Senator will pardon me—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield further?

Mr. HARDWICK. I do.

Mr. THOMAS. If they had informed the committee that they had committed themselves and were in honor bound to vote to recommit this bill, as we would know full well that that meant to settle it for all time, so far as this session was concerned, we necessarily would have had to accept it as a finality. I am here to say, Mr. President, that I believe if this bill is recommitment without positive and mandatory instructions to re-report it, it is "as dead as Caesar" at this session of Congress.

Mr. HARDWICK. I want to say to the Senator when he makes that statement he takes a great deal upon himself.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, it is my belief, and I will assume all the responsibility.

Mr. HARDWICK. It is an awful responsibility for a Member of this body to take about the conduct of his associates with which he is not informed.

Mr. THOMAS. I said that was the assumption made in consequence of negotiations ended, and also that it is my belief and my conviction that the recommitment of the bill means its death, in so far as this session is concerned.

Mr. HARDWICK. That any bill will pass at all at this session is a matter of great doubt under these rules and with vigorous and determined opposition to a measure of this kind. At this present session of Congress the Senator knows as well as I do that it is almost beyond our power to pass such a measure unless we were harmoniously united on a certain proposition, and even then it is doubtful.

But what I do say to the Senator, and what I do not want him to get wrong, is this, that it is possible that this bill might be amended so as to meet some of the most serious objections of Senators on this side so that we all might have a chance to agree on it and to see that a united Democratic, or practically a solid Democratic, support should be given to it.

Mr. President, I had intended, before I discovered how much time I was consuming, to make some few references to some of the gentle and diplomatic statements of my two friends, the distinguished Senators from Missouri. The junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] is one of my warmest personal friends in this body. He is one of the gentlemen who made me welcome in it, and he has done all he could in a personal way to make my short stay in this body pleasant. So far as the junior Senator from Missouri, whom personally I like very much, undertook to read us a lecture about the "poor old Shipping Trust," of course he did not mean to do it; he was speaking upon the spur of the moment and in excitement when he intimated that this Shipping Trust had somebody by the throat. If the Senator meant to apply that to any one of his colleagues on this side, either he or the Senator in question would be unworthy of a seat here. I know the Senator from Missouri did not mean anything of the kind. It just shows to what extreme men can go when they get excited. And yet I have heard such suggestions as that thrown out on this floor on all sides in debate. They are simply disgusting. They are unworthy of Senators and unworthy of the Senate, and can not be made legitimately under the rules of this body.

Now, I will not say any more on that. It is beneath my notice, and I have not intended to hurt the Senator's feelings in saying that much. I say it is beneath my notice and beneath my dignity and worthy only of contempt. So far as I am concerned, I shall make no reply to such vile suggestions. Of course the Senator meant nothing personal by it, but I say this to the junior Senator from Missouri, his present rôle is both refreshing and unusual. With all the zeal of a recent convert he rushes to attack a position that he thinks the President now holds, and assails the position that the President assumes in public speech and public message. Oh, gentlemen, if I had not made these remarks too long and if good nature permitted me, I would be glad to read to the Senate and the country a few chapters from REED on Regularity.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. HARDWICK. Certainly.

Mr. REED. I trust the gentleman will do so. If he can find where I have ever violated a Democratic platform, where I have ever broken a caucus regulation, where I ever have either gone into a caucus or stayed out of a caucus and refused to obey the will of the majority of my associates expressed in caucus, I shall be very glad to have him present the evidence.

Mr. HARDWICK. If I could do it, I would not.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator can not do it.

Mr. HARDWICK. Well, I might call attention to some things.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

Mr. HARDWICK. I could call attention to some recent performances of the Senator. I do not know whether you made the banking and currency bill a party measure or not. Did you? They did in the other House?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, we took the banking and currency bill into caucus. I sat in caucus and I helped to frame it in caucus. I made a speech for it on the floor. I defended it from attack on the floor. I voted for it.

Mr. HARDWICK. What was the Senator trying to do when he was kicking up so much stir over here?

Mr. REED. I expect I was agitating a number of misinformed gentlemen who did not know what the committee was doing or what I was doing. We were trying to make the bill a good and workable bill.

Mr. HARDWICK. That is what we are trying to do with this one.

Mr. REED. No; the cases are not parallel.

Mr. HARDWICK. All right.

Mr. REED. That hole in the fence is not large enough even for the gentleman to squeeze through. If the Senator will allow me—

Mr. HARDWICK. Certainly, I will yield to the Senator as long as he likes.

Mr. REED. I am glad the Senator has brought up this matter. The banking and currency bill came from the House of Representatives and went to the Committee on Banking and Currency. Many grave questions came up in the committee which the committee discussed from time to time. One of the early questions was whether there should be hearings. In company with some others I insisted upon hearings. We continued the hearings for about two weeks, with the result that the chairman of the committee, who had himself introduced into the Senate an exact duplicate of the House bill, wrote and submitted some 234 amendments. Thereafter we continued our deliberations, various important amendments being made. Then came a division in the committee, which I think never ought to have occurred. In company with the Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN] I joined the four Democrats who had seen fit to leave the committee; we joined them and sat with them and continued to amend the bill. Finally a caucus was called, and we carried the bill to the caucus of our associates. We debated it with them; we took party counsel upon it; and when the caucus had passed upon the bill, we came on the floor of the Senate and defended it.

Now, that is the fact, no matter what the fuss may have been. I say frankly to the Senator I do not blame him for laboring under a misunderstanding, because there was a good deal of wild talk at that time, but, so far as my part is concerned, if a man's party regularity can be demonstrated by his acts, my regularity and devotion to the party was demonstrated by my every act in regard to that bill. As is well known, I gave up many things that I thought were important, yielding to the judgment of my associates, and finally spoke and voted for the bill as the caucus had directed. Moreover, as one of the conferees of the Senate, I contended stubbornly to sustain in conference the mandates of the Democratic caucus.

Now, if the Senator knows of any other particular irregularity of mine, I would be glad to have him mention it.

Mr. HARDWICK. Well, I do not believe I will; I might.

Mr. REED. I should be glad to have the Senator try. He could do it if anybody could.

Mr. HARDWICK. As far as that is concerned, let me say to the Senator that to my mind consistency is one of the important virtues, and I would be the last man in the world to criticize him for some of his performances, even if they were untenable, as I thought they were. So I will not pursue the subject. I accept the statement the Senator makes about his own conduct. He knows better than anybody else in the world. I had an idea that he had been kicking up a good deal, and that the rôle of President's defender and champion of the party caucus was a new one for him. But I am new to the Senate, and I may not know.

Mr. REED. Will the Senator pardon a further interruption?

Mr. HARDWICK. Certainly.

Mr. REED. I am not posing as the President's defender. I have not undertaken that rôle. I have not been requested to assume it. I think the President is not likely to call on anyone to act as his mouthpiece or champion. This particular bill commended itself to my judgment, not in every respect but in its main features. I went into the party caucus. By going into the caucus, I in effect said to every other member of the caucus, "I meet with you; I shall insist upon my views; if I get them, I will be happy and you must abide the result. If, on the other hand, my views are not accepted and yours are, I shall likewise abide by the result." That has been my attitude.

I made a speech here the other day, as the Senator says, on the spur of the moment. If he will permit me just one word, I did not in that speech say the Senator from Georgia or any Senator was owned by the Shipping Trust. I meant nothing of the kind. I meant to say that the action they had taken seriously endangered if not, in fact, killed the shipping bill. I meant to say that the Shipping Trust had been opposing this bill, as it has been opposing nearly every other bill that has been introduced in Congress for many years which in any way trenches upon its supreme control of the shipping business of the seas. I said, and now say, that the votes which had then just been cast had made the trust very happy. I did not mean to say that the trust had reached, by improper influences, any Senator. Indeed I know some Senators who voted for the motion to refer the bill who were inspired by the loftiest, although the most mistaken, of motives. I know that; but unfortunately those lofty motives led them to take action which exactly coordinated with the desires of the Shipping Trust, and so I made a few remarks about the Shipping Trust.

As far as the personal honor, honesty, and integrity of the Senator from Georgia are concerned, no man has ever questioned it. I certainly would be the last to do so.

Mr. HARDWICK. I thank the Senator. Of course I knew he felt that way. I know further that if the Senator from Missouri had in his campaign made pledges to his constituency inconsistent with the support of this measure, in its pending form at least, he would not abate therefrom one jot or tittle. No party conference or caucus could require such a sacrifice of any Senator. It would be infamous if it sought to do so.

Mr. President, I have almost concluded the remarks that I wished to make. In the beginning of my remarks to-day I told the Senate and the country my high estimate of the present President of the United States. At a time when many Senators on this floor who now are almost sycophantic in their attitude were fighting him from one end of this Republic to the other and were asserting that he was unworthy of the Democratic nomination for the Presidency, I was at home campaigning my own State for him and doing my best there and elsewhere for his nomination as well as election. I did not then agree, and I did not thereby agree, to surrender my manhood to him, to surrender my judgment to him, to surrender my principles to him, and I should never have had the high respect for him I have if I thought he was a man to even desire such a sacrifice of any man.

Mr. President, I will say one thing, because it ought to be said, and it ought to be said in this presence, on this floor, and now, in my honest judgment. I do not know what has led the President into a position of appearing to coerce the Congress. I sometimes think the Members of both Houses of Congress have gone to him and pushed him into these things, have sought to unload their troubles on him, to unload their responsibilities on his broad and magnificent shoulders, until we have gotten into a situation, in my judgment, which is unfortunate for this country.

For one I believe in the coordination of powers. I believe in the legislative, executive, and judicial powers of this Government remaining independent, separate, and coordinate and co-equal. For one I dare assert in this presence, here and now, that it will be a sad day for this Republic, a sad day for the Democratic Party, a sad day for whatever party establishes the practice or the doctrine that legislation is to be written by the executive departments of the Government and that this great Senate, so long the sheet anchor of American Government, in many respects surrenders its independence to any man, however great. God forbid that that day should come. I should feel recreant to the oath I took at that stand, I should feel unworthy of the imperial State whose commission I bear on this floor, if I did not stand in my manhood against any such thing as that.

The President of the United States in vetoing the immigration bill used this expression in withholding his approval, as I said a moment ago, from a measure on which almost two-thirds of his legislative colleagues in the Democratic Party dissent from him. He used these words:

But candor and a sense of duty with regard to the responsibility so clearly imposed upon me by the Constitution in matters of legislation leave me no choice but to dissent.

The President is right, everlastingly right, although I disagree with him fundamentally on that particular question. If his judgment and his conscience do not approve a measure, if every Democrat in both Houses of Congress voted for it, he ought to veto it; but I say that same doctrine applies to a Senator of these United States and to a Member of the House of Representatives. They, too, have constitutional functions to perform; they, too, have sacred public duties to discharge. I

say that any one of them would be false to the highest and best conception of American government if he did not stand for his own convictions, if he did not do what he believed to be right. I do not mean by that to say that we must not have party cooperation, and even party action, on subjects that are real party matters; but I do say that a man ought to stand by his conscience and his judgment as to what is right and wrong in legislation, and he ought to keep the pledges he has made, just as it is reported—and, of course, there is no doubt about it—that the President was keeping a pledge made in the campaign when he vetoed the immigration bill.

I read again from President Woodrow Wilson's speech at Indianapolis on Jackson Day, in which he himself describes his concept of his duties and responsibilities as to matters of this kind. He said:

I am not an independent voter, but I hope I can claim to be an independent person.

Ah, Senators, I am not an independent voter, but I hope I can claim to be an independent Senator when it comes to these great fundamental questions on which I am pledged to my own people, and which I have a right not only in party forums but in that higher forum of conscience and of honor and of duty to assert my convictions. The President said:

I am not an independent voter, but I hope I can claim to be an independent person; and I want to say this distinctly. I do not love any party any longer than it continues to serve the immediate and pressing needs of America. I have been bred in the Democratic Party, but I love America a great deal more than I love the Democratic Party.

A broad, independent, patriotic statement from a great American. I am not reading it to criticize him, but I am reading it to ask the Senate and the people of this country how seven Senators, who, following a profound conviction of public duty, have dared to be independent, have dared to voice their convictions for what is best, for what is right, and for what is necessary for the people of this country, can be criticized for exercising that same independence for which we glorify our great President.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEA of Tennessee in the chair). The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, the able argument just delivered by the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] leaves very little for me to say or rather makes it necessary for me to say but very little in defense of the position which I have taken on this bill, and for which I have been, along with the other six recalcitrants, very bitterly and cruelly criticized.

Mr. President, the Democratic Party is greater than any man, or self-selected set of men, however great they may be in their own conceit. The virtue of the Democratic Party is in the purity of its principles, and its strength lies in the conscientious judgment, the moral qualities, and intellectual acquirements of its adherents. In the realm of reason there is no proscription and where pure democracy prevails shackles are unknown.

"We must be free or die who speak the tongue  
That Shakespeare spake: the faith and morals hold  
Which Milton held."

The hour has struck, the time has arrived when calmness and serious thought, undisturbed by passion and uncolored by prejudice, should characterize the deliberations of this body. An angered brain is the storm center of indiscretion—the Pandora box of infinite evil. A wise economy of words in debate may probably serve to cement and unite the Democrats of this body in the service of the Nation. Let me commend to the Senate, and especially my brethren on this side, the wise words of an ancient Greek, whose heroic soul had felt the hot iron of adversity and experienced the trials and vicissitudes of a stormy public career:

"Tossed on a sea of troubles, Soul, my Soul,  
Thyself do thou control;  
And to the weapons of advancing foes  
A stubborn breast oppose;  
Undaunted 'mid the hostile might  
Of squadrons burning for the fight,  
Thine be no boasting when the victor's crown  
Wins thee deserved renown;  
Thine no dejected sorrow, when defeat  
Would urge a base retreat;  
Rejoice in joyous things—nor overmuch  
Let grief thy bosom touch  
'Midst evil, and still bear in mind  
How changeable are the ways of humankind."

Mr. President, we were regaled with a very remarkable fulmination in this Chamber from one of the Members of this body on Wednesday afternoon. I shall not emulate the example of

the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri in the manner of his oratory or the viciousness and egotism of the subject matter of his extraordinary discourse. His verbal evacuation is flavored with the bile of malice and smells to heaven with the odor of duplicity and the stifling fumes of injustice. His arrogant assumption of leadership of the Democratic Party in the United States Senate would be considered immodest and unbecoming—aye, unexpected—of one less gifted in the art of political tergiversation and sleight-of-hand performance in the rôle of statecraft. His fame for performing acrobatic feats and the harmonizing accomplishments of the chameleon, like the fame of Joshua of old, has been noised abroad throughout the land. I would not transgress the rules of this body or be guilty of the indecorum of which I would be guilty if I dared to reciprocate in kind the courtesies shown by the distinguished Senator in debate to the seven Senators who were the targets of his obloquy and biting criticism by relating all that rumor whispers—much of which may be true, but I trust not, of the peculiar antics cut in politics, in days gone by, by the learned and choleric senatorial scold from Missouri. Behold him as he appeared on that occasion in this Chamber. A past grand master in the rôle of mock heroics, with a countenance clouded with the gathering storm of affected righteous indignation, his lips pouting like the mouth of the blowfish emptying its belly of bad air, eyes streaked with the fury of the tempest raging in his outraged soul, he holds up to the scorn and contempt of the American people Senators whose only offense was refusal to yield to his imperious dictation—to crook the pregnant hinges of the knee that patronage might follow fawning—to violate their every sense of obligation to their constituents and repudiate every idea of loyalty to the Democratic Party, its platform of principles, and its sacred, time-honored traditions, to follow his lead.

Mr. President, in the name of all the dead gods of ancient Greece at once, upon what meat doth this great Senator feed that he hath suddenly grown so puffed up? Mr. President, the issue which confronts the Democratic Party and the Nation at this moment is an important one. The present is pregnant with much good or much harm to the Republic. It may be the turning point of time in the economic policy of this great Government; it may be the inauguration of a policy which may work for the good of all the people, for the preservation of our institutions, and for the general welfare of humanity. On the other hand, the result may be the contrary of what I have described and for which we all hope. I trust, however, the former may be its fate. I believe in Democratic principles. I believe in the Democratic polity of government. I believe that upon the right understanding and correct application of Democratic principles depends the life of the Republic. I am also profoundly of the opinion that Democratic ideas and principles can not be enacted into law without maintaining a compact, efficient, militant organization. As a matter of truth no great governmental scheme or principle of political economy was ever enacted into law but that had behind it the all-impelling force to that end, of a well organized and disciplined political faction. For that reason I have always believed in party primaries and conventions. I have always maintained that political platforms should be carefully framed and thoroughly considered, and when adopted by the people they should be carried out religiously in letter and spirit by the public servants of the people. They should be the political confession of faith for every man and woman who maintains allegiance to that organization. There is no obligation so binding upon me in the performance of my duties as a United States Senator as the platform promises enunciated at Baltimore upon which Gov. Woodrow Wilson ran and was elected President of these United States. That platform is the chart which shall guide me over the political seas during the next two years as it has been the chart to guide me in the two years just past. That platform shall be the polar star by which my political craft shall be steered. To that platform I owe allegiance and I shall not respect or recognize the right of any one man, or 36 men, behind closed doors, away from the searching eye of public scrutiny, under the direction, probably, of some extraneous influence, to do and utter things which many of them in their hearts may not believe or approve, to instruct me to violate that platform.

Now, let us consider this question for a moment. Let us see if there is anything in the Baltimore platform touching upon the question at issue. The Democratic platform of 1912 contains this plank:

"We believe in fostering, by constitutional regulation of commerce, the growth of a merchant marine, which shall develop and strengthen the commercial ties which bind us to our sister Republics of the south, but without imposing additional burdens

upon the people and without bounties or subsidies from the Public Treasury."

Is there anything in this bill demanded by this plank of the platform? Are the ships proposed to be bought to be run at public expense? The President announced in the outset that the venture was to be of such a doubtful nature that private capital could not be expected to invest. "Big business" could not afford it, but the patient toiler who can not help himself may be taxed to supply the necessary funds. Is it proposed to take any money out of the Public Treasury for the purpose of carrying on this losing business? Is any additional burden to be put upon the aching stoop of the man who tills the soil? Is toll to be exacted of the man who delves into the bowels of the earth and takes out the coal that makes the steam that turns the wheels of commerce? The laboring men on the railroads, in the shops, and factories—are they expected to make good the losses of this business?

The farmers of Mississippi and the South were forced to sell their cotton last fall at less than one half of its value because of the conditions brought about by the war in Europe for which they were in no way responsible, and when we went to the Federal Government, when we implored the President, to help us pass the bill providing for lending the Government's credit that the farmers might be enabled to hold their cotton and wait for normal conditions to be restored before being forced to sell we were met with the statement that such a proposition was socialistic, populist, and visionary. We were told that the head and not the heart must settle this problem. It was socialism to help the toiler; it was populism run mad to help protect the man whose labor clothes and feeds the world; but it is orthodox democracy, sound political economy, and the flowering of justice now to take the money contributed for the support of the Government by the suffering laborer and spend it to maintain a line of boats to carry the cotton to foreign markets for the speculator and the broker. Not content with permitting the farmer to be robbed of the products of his patient toil he must now be burdened with another debt in order that the great masters of finance, the promoters of "big business" shall enjoy larger profits. And I as the representative, the servant, of that toiler, commissioned by him and all classes of people in my State to do equal and exact justice to all and special favors to none in matters of legislation, am commanded by the secret caucus to vote to pile higher and higher still the burden under which he is now groaning.

Mr. President, the suggestion is monstrous. It outrages every idea of loyalty and sense of fidelity to a sacred trust. I believe a man can stay in Washington long enough to lose the common touch, to forget him who, bowed by the weight of taxation, leans upon his hoe and gazes upon the ground, the tragedy of injustice written upon his sad face and on his back the burden of the world. Rather than betray him in that way I would surrender my commission—my right to a seat in this Chamber—and go back to the quiet shades of private life.

I have no fear of the withering scorn of the self-constituted censor of the secret caucus, the petulant senior Senator from Missouri; his threat of political ostracism has no terrors for me at all. I despise with all my heart and spurn with ineffable contempt the suggestion. My service to the Democratic Party in this body does not depend upon what somebody may think, say, or do. I am not a mere parasite, existing upon the patronage of power or the prestige of place. I shall live by my own convictions. I shall act the things I believe. "No pleasure to me is comparable to standing upon the vantage ground of truth." And from the altitude of that high purpose I shall look down with pitying contempt on the unfortunate individual who would question my right to do so.

But let us go a little further. The Democrats, in the platform of 1908, had this to say:

"We believe in upbuilding the American merchant marine without new or additional burdens upon the people and without bounties from the Public Treasury."

When was that command withdrawn? Who authorized the self-idolized leaders of the immortal thirty-six to revoke that order?

But that is not all. The platform of 1904 has something to say on this subject also:

"We denounce the ship-subsidy bill recently passed by the United States Senate as an iniquitous appropriation of public funds for private purposes and a wasteful, illogical, and useless attempt to overcome by subsidy the obstructions raised by Republican legislation to the growth and development of American commerce on the sea. We favor the upbuilding of a merchant marine without new or additional burdens upon the people and without bounties from the Public Treasury."

There is no doubt about the meaning of that language either. It has no uncertain sound. It is the voice of the untirred, patriotic, brave masses of this Republic—the men who really keep the banner of democracy in the air—men who would “spurn with contumely the power that bends the coward’s knees and forces from the lips of treachery the lies of praise.” If it was the truth then—principles do not, like Senators, change; they are immortal—it is the truth now, and I will not violate it.

Mr. President, I have searched the annals of the Democratic Party. I have studied carefully its platform announcements. I have read the great debates of able Senators—George, of Mississippi, one of the greatest constitutional lawyers who ever sat in this body; the erudite and accomplished Vest, of Missouri, in whose seat the scolding Senator from that State now expands; and scores of others—who have discussed the question of ship subsidy in this Chamber, and I have failed utterly to discover or find one scintilla of argument of approval in the history of the party in favor of the principles involved in this ship-purchase bill. To my mind it is the worst form of subsidy, because we do not know how much it is going to cost the taxpayers. It is vaguely indefinite—the flowering of legislative disingenuousness. It is also class legislation of the most indefensible and atrocious type. Whatever may be its purpose or design, there is one thing certain—it will not do the laborer, the farmer, the producer, any good. As I said a moment ago, the laborer will bear the burden and somebody else will reap the profits.

No, it will not benefit the men who need help, but, on the contrary, the patient, silent, long-suffering many will be forced by this law to contribute their hard-earned pennies to the already plethoric purses of the favored few.

You can not build up a merchant marine such as is contemplated in the Democratic platform of 1912—such as all patriotic Americans desire, such as I with all my heart desire—at the expense of the Government unless you are going to build up a permanent Government-owned merchant marine. It has been clearly and unmistakably demonstrated in this Chamber that in order to make a shipping business profitable there must be land connections, there must be feeders to give the ships cargoes. You can no more build up a profitable, independent, permanent merchant marine under this bill than you can teach a child to walk without putting its feet on the floor.

Now, if it is the purpose of the President to embark the United States Government upon a new policy—if the principles for which the Democratic Party has stood during all of its history are to be set aside and the National Government is to go into the business of owning ships and other agencies of transportation and commerce—I shall be glad to cooperate with the President in the development of a plan looking to that end. But it is a matter that can not be worked out in a day. For such an undertaking to succeed the foundations for the superstructure must be laid broad and deep. Perfect symmetry must be preserved if the system shall endure. And I do not think that the Democratic administration would be justified in embarking upon this entirely new policy until the people shall have been given an opportunity to pass upon it. I have infinite faith in the good judgment and divine common sense of the masses. This is their Government, and before taking a step which involves a measure of such far-reaching consequences I prefer to hear from the people.

Discussing this question, the historian Bancroft said—and I quote his language as the better expression of my own views:

“If reason is a universal faculty, universal decision is the nearest criterion of truth. The common mind winnows opinions; it is the sieve which separates error from certainty. The exercise by many of the same faculty on the same subject would naturally lead to the same conclusions. But if not, the very differences of opinion that arise prove the supreme judgment of the general mind.”

“The public is wiser than the wisest critic. In Athens the arts were carried to perfection when the ‘fierce democracy’ was in the ascendant; the temple of Minerva and the works of Phidias were planned and perfected to please the common people. When Greece yielded to tyrants her genius for excellence in art expired, or, rather, the purity of taste disappeared, because the artist then endeavored to gratify a patron and therefore humored his caprice, while before he had endeavored to delight the race.”

“In like manner, the best government rests on the people and not on the few, on persons and not on property, on the free development of public opinion and not on authority, because the munificent Author of our being has conferred the gifts of mind

upon every member of the human race without distinction of outward circumstances. Whatever of other possessions may be engrossed, the mind asserts its own independence. Lands, estates, the produce of minds, the prolific abundance of the seas, may be usurped by a privileged class. Avarice assuming the form of ambitious power may grasp realm after realm, subdue continents, compass the earth in its schemes of aggrandizement, and sigh after worlds, but mind eludes the power of appropriation; it exists only in its own individuality. It is a property which can not be confiscated and can not be torn away. It laughs at chance, it bursts from imprisonment, it defies monopoly. A government of equal rights must, therefore, rest upon mind, not wealth, not brute force; some of the moral intelligence of the community should rule the state. Proscription can no more assume to be a valid plea for political injustice; society studies to eradicate established abuses and to bring social institutions and laws into harmony with moral right—not dismayed by the natural and necessary imperfections of all human effort, and not giving way to despair because every hope does not at once ripen into fruit.

“It is hard for the pride of cultivated philosophy to put its ear to the ground and listen reverently to the voice of lowly humanity; yet the people collectively are wiser than the most gifted individual, for all his wisdom constitutes but a part of others. When the great sculptor of Greece was endeavoring to fashion the perfect model of beauty he did not passively imitate the form of the loveliest woman of his age, but he gleaned the several lineaments of his faultless work from the many. And so it is that a perfect judgment is the result of comparison, where error eliminates error and truth is established by concurring witnesses. The organ of truth is the invisible decision of the unbiased world; she pleads before no tribunal but public opinion; she owns no safe interpreter but the common mind; she knows no court of appeals but the soul of humanity. It is when the multitude give counsel that right purposes find safety; theirs is the fixedness that can not be shaken; theirs is the understanding which exceeds in wisdom; theirs is the heart of which the largeness is as the sand on the seashore.”

“It is alone by infusing great principles into the common mind that revolutions in human society are brought about. They never have been, they never can be, effected by superior individual excellence. The age of the Antonines is the age of the greatest glory of the Roman Empire. Men distinguished by every accomplishment of culture and science for a century in succession possessed undisputed sway over more than 100,000,000 men, until at last, in the person of Marcus Aurelius, philosophy herself seemed to mount the throne. And did she stay the downward tendencies of the Roman Empire? Did she infuse new elements of life into the decaying constitution? Did she commence one great beneficent reform? Not one permanent amelioration was effected. Philosophy was clothed with absolute power, and yet absolute power accomplished nothing for humanity. It could accomplish nothing. Had it been possible Aurelius would have wrought a change. Society can be regenerated, the human race can be advanced only by moral principles diffused through the multitude.”

As to the wisdom of waiting for an expression from the people, I take the same position on this question that the President does on the question of woman suffrage, and in his veto message on the immigration bill. While it is not pertinent to the question at issue, it is not out of place at this time for me to say in this connection that I do not agree with a great many of my colleagues on the question of Government ownership of public utilities. I remember when the Hon. W. J. Bryan, some years ago, made the prediction that Government ownership of railroads would come in the course of time. His prediction raised such a violent storm of protest in the ranks of the Democratic Party that it looked for a while like the idol of Democracy was going to be knocked into a cocked hat, but not with dignity. I was editing a newspaper in Mississippi at the time, and I was among the few who defended that great statesman’s views. Government ownership of railroads, telephones, telegraph lines, and other public utilities has no terror for me. Nor am I opposed to Government ownership of steamboat lines, when I am sure that they are going to be run for the benefit of all the people and contribute to the well-being of society. But this is a matter that can not be entered into in a moment. It is a system that can not be established in a day. The suggestion that it is an emergency measure has no merit in truth.

Now, I want to again asseverate my desire and loyalty to every proposition to build up a merchant marine. Since I came to the Senate as a Member of this body I have voted for every

measure looking to the proper upbuilding of a merchant marine. I have endeavored to carry out the platform as interpreted by the President when he was a candidate for the Presidency in building up a merchant marine. By giving them free passage through the canal, I hoped to stimulate the spirit of enterprise tending to that end. And I also maintained that we have the legal and moral right to extend these special privileges to our own ships, not only ships engaged in coastwise trade but ships engaged in over-seas commerce. With all my heart I believe in building up a merchant marine according to constitutional methods and sound economic principles. But I do not think it would be safe to embark upon a policy of Government ownership at this time for the reasons I have already stated.

Now, something has been said in this discussion about the influence of the Shipping Trust upon certain Senators whose position on this bill does not please a majority on this side of the Chamber. That same unjust intimation was made when a majority of the Democrats, followed the lead of the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. Root], in violation of the Democratic platform on the tolls question. They charged us with protecting the coastwise shipping monopoly. But when an opportunity came to open up to the shipbuilders and shipowners of every country in the world the privilege of engaging in the coastwise trade of America these same Democratic Senators who were inclined to denounce the monopoly when the tolls bill was up voted to exclude foreign-built ships.

O, consistency, I fear thou art not the choicest jewel of the senatorial soul!

But, Mr. President, I do not like to dwell upon this phase of this subject. It is indisputable evidence of weakness of any cause for its advocates to abandon the high plane of legitimate argument and descend into the mire of villification. It is unworthy and unbecoming a Senator to indulge in such dishonest and contemptible methods. Their cause must be a weak one if to support it they must resort to such miserable and disingenuous schemes. If the agents of the shipowners of Europe and America have appeared upon the scene, if one of them has discussed this question with a Democratic Senator, be he for or against the bill, I have not heard of it. I am sure such a one has not favored me with the courtesy of a call. I am not, Mr. President, a very hospitable host to the man who is lobbying for legislation in his own interest, and therefore I am not at all surprised that I have been overlooked.

But, Mr. President, the suggestion, I repeat, is too contemptible to deserve even a passing notice. Such a statement, if intended for me, falls absolutely harmless at my feet. Conscious of the rectitude of my position, with no other desire save to serve the people of Mississippi and America as God has given me the light to see it, I can view with serenity the miserable machinations of those who would attempt to injure me. No; it does not hurt me in the least, but it places the man who suggests it in antithesis to truth. He is the antipodal of veracity. He injures his own soul by his mendacity, but does not hurt me. I should despise myself if I had nothing to support my position on this measure but mere suspicion that some banker or his kinsman close to the administration had suggested the purchase of the interned German ships in order that some official high in authority might ultimately profit by it. I do not believe anything of the kind. I believe the President and his Cabinet and the majority of Senators on this floor are doing what they believe to be their duty under the circumstances. Whatever may be their motives, it in no way affects my own. And I despise with all my heart the methods of the assassin of character, it matters not by whom practiced.

But we have been criticized for conferring with the Republicans on this measure. I see nothing morally or politically wrong in that. I have discussed a great many public questions which have come before the Senate with the Republicans of the Senate. But I have not gone to the Republicans in this instance. The Republicans have come to me. I am standing on the indestructible rock of Democratic truth and intrenched behind Democratic precedent. The Republicans have abandoned their former position on the question of ship subsidy and have come over to help us defend the Baltimore platform against its former friends.

Times change and men change with them.

"Now the good god forbid  
That our renown'd Rome, whose gratitude  
Toward her deserved children is enroll'd  
In Jove's own books, like an unnatural dam  
Should now eat up her own."

But, admitting for the sake of this discussion that the majority of my Democratic colleagues are correct, can it possibly be any worse or more of a crime for me to confer with the Republicans than for the Democratic President and his Don

Quixote lieutenant, the astute senior Senator [Mr. Stone] from Missouri, to plow with the heifers of the Progressive element of the Republican Party? It does not lie in the mouth of you gentlemen who have been offering to members of the Republican Party the privilege of amending the bill and going into partnership with you in its formation to criticize me or any other Senator for conferring with the Republicans to the end that we may defeat what we believe to be a measure congenitally pernicious.

Now, I do not object to the President conferring with the Republican Senators. He can do it if he will, but people who live in glass houses ought not to carry too many rocks about in their pockets. Really, Mr. President, I think if this bill shall be passed at all, it should be passed with Republican votes. It is essentially a Republican measure.

Now, a matter personal to myself. It is always distasteful to me to be in discord with the head of my party and those with whom I affiliate politically. But if I am so mentally constituted that I can not change my views on a serious and important matter just to please some one else, I must do one of two things—I must stand by my own convictions and bear the odium of being characterized as a recalcitrant, or prostitute myself by becoming a mere puppet to be moved by the presidential pull. That I will not do. The President may be right. He is a man of great learning. I have never questioned his patriotism. He has his duty to perform as President of this Republic. I honor him for doing it according to the dictates of his own conscience. I sympathize with him, and he has my best wishes. I honor the man—

"Born and taught  
That serveth not another's will,  
Whose armour is his honest thought,  
And simple truth his utmost skill."

And I arrogate to myself nothing that I do not cheerfully concede to every other man. When this bill came before the Committee on Commerce, I studied it carefully and I endeavored to find out its purposes and to reach a conclusion as to its ultimate effect. I thought the bill should provide that the ships to be purchased should engage in the coastwise trade. My purpose was to reduce the loss to the minimum, and at the same time lower freight rates and thereby break the coastwise shipping monopoly. Some of my colleagues agreed with me, but they said that if that provision were inserted it would result in defeating the bill. They were endeavoring to carry out the President's wishes. They insisted that the measure was temporary in its character—a mere makeshift. It was expected to be a losing investment at first; but they hoped that after a while, when the gates of commerce should be opened wide, it would become profitable, after which the Government was to turn the business over to private enterprise. I said that I could not vote for the bill. I gave my reasons for it in the following interview, which appeared in the public press long before anybody except possibly those who are permitted to enter the holy of holies of the White House thought of making the measure a party question.

I ask permission to have this appear in my remarks without reading, Mr. President.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

"I am opposed to this bill because I believe it is the most indefensible form of subsidy yet proposed. It is one of those peculiarly dishonest measures which will 'keep the word of promise to the ear and break it to the hope.' It is violative of every tradition and platform declaration of the Democratic Party. The scheme, as interpreted by the President, is a mistake in policy, wrong in morals, pernicious in principle, and therefore will be disappointing in its ultimate results.

"FINDS NO JUSTIFICATION.

"If the Government ownership and operation of steamboat and railroad lines is to become a permanent policy, there might be some little excuse or justification for this measure; but when we are told by the President that it is only a temporary makeshift—and who will question the authority of the President to speak in this matter?—it leaves it without excuse or justification. In his address to Congress on the 8th of December last the President said: 'It should take action to make it certain that transportation at reasonable rates will be promptly provided, even when the carriage is not at first profitable; and then, when the carriage has become sufficiently profitable to attract and engage private capital and engage it in abundance, the Government ought to withdraw.'

"It is a peculiar character of mind which reasons to a conclusion and justifies the appropriation and expenditure of

funds contributed by all the people to an enterprise of this character, which it is admitted must be a losing and unprofitable investment from the start. Congress has just as much right to donate funds from the Public Treasury to the cotton growers of the South who, because of the war in Europe, have lost by the depreciation of the product of their farms something like \$450,000,000 this year. Congress has just as much authority to subsidize the cane growers of Louisiana, the beet growers of the Northwest, and the manufacturers of the Northeast as it has to appropriate money to buy ships to carry the manufacturers' products to foreign markets at the cost of all the taxpayers. The cotton growers of the South proposed to give the Government unquestioned security for the loan of \$250,000,000 of credit in order to save themselves a loss of \$500,000,000, but the Congress, headed by the President, turned a deaf ear to their appeal.

"If their demand was without merits or wrong in principle, who will say this measure is right? I am opposed to this bill because it is class legislation, pernicious in its conception, and necessarily unjust in its execution.

"SEES WASTE OF MONEY.

"It will be remembered that the bill provides for ships to engage in the foreign trade exclusively. The cast-iron, rock-ribbed, Government-favored coastwise monopoly is treated as a sacred thing—too sacred to be touched. The Government-owned boats are to be mere pioneers or business missionaries, as it were. Regardless of the expense, they are expected to go to the waste places of the earth and work up the business to be turned over later to private individuals, who are to reap the profits of a business which has been built up at the expense of all the people. The whole scheme, to my mind, involves an unwarranted, illegal, and immoral prodigality of money coined by the sweat and blood of the masses of this country and extorted from them by unjust and immoral laws.

"It is a dangerous departure, an innovation upon our time-honored system, violative of the spirit of our Government, and, I fear, the issue will be trouble to the party that proposes it and chagrin for the men who conceive it. I am in favor of an American merchant marine. I shall vote for such measures as may be necessary to put our ships on the dead level of opportunity with the ships of all other countries that come into our ports. If we shall by law, which we have a right to do, improve the standard of living for the sailors, we will at the same time elevate the standard of character and manhood of the men who operate the ships.

"OPPOSES HOTHOUSE ECONOMICS.

"I am opposed to the hothouse methods of economics in governmental matters. I do not think it is fair to take the money from the pocket of the wealth producers of this country and donate it to the owners of ships. Such a policy can not be justified by any other rule than that of the rule of might. It can not be defended upon any other theory than that might is right. The contention that the ships be bought under the terms of this bill will facilitate the transportation of cotton grown in the South to the foreign markets is not the proper spissitude to fool anybody. The suggestion that the Government of the United States will send its ships to places where privately owned ships flying the American flag will not go is absurd. As a matter of fact, Government-owned ships will be more careful not to violate the laws of neutrality. They will be more careful to avoid every possible complication with the belligerent powers of Europe than will ships owned by private individuals.

"But there is one thing that would happen, I am quite sure. A lot of unprofitable property in ships that are floating idly in the ports of this country in order to hide from the gunboats of hostile nations would be unloaded upon the Government of the United States at a good profit. And I am sure that after the war is over, and especially after the people of the United States shall have had an opportunity to pass judgment upon this proposed bill, that these same ships will be resold to private owners, and the American people will pocket a loss of \$75,000,000 to \$100,000,000. No; to my mind, the bill is a legislative evil without a mitigating incident, and, from the depths of my heart, I sincerely hope it may be defeated."

Mr. VARDAMAN. This statement was published. Little thought I at the time that the pressure from the White House would ever lead the Democratic Senators to undertake to make this indefensible measure, as I regard it, a party question; a measure which is a flagrant violation of the letter and the spirit of the party platform. When the caucus was called to consider it I told the chairman of the caucus, the honorable junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN], that I would not attend the caucus. I did not expect to support the bill, and I did not care to take part in framing the bill when I felt sure what the

conclusion of the caucus would be. I believed then what I now know, that the White House had ordered it, and that the Senators would obey that order, and I did not want to place myself in the indelicate position of being present while the measure was being framed when I was sure that my sense of duty would lead me to oppose it on the floor of the Senate. So I remained away from the caucus. And when I was told that I was bound as a Democrat by certain of my colleagues, who behind closed doors had determined to buck and gag every Senator who differed from them, to override my wishes, strangle my independence, humiliate my manhood, in a word, for me to violate my sense of duty and obligations to my constituents and betray the Democratic platform and support this measure, Mr. President, I simply declined to make the sacrifice. I declined to yield my own individuality. I must refuse to violate my idea of duty to myself and my constituents in order that I might win the much-coveted, approving smile of the seldom-smiling senior Senator from Missouri as reward for party regularity.

No; "I shall not be carried about by every wind of doctrine" that may blow from the wind centers of sycophancy. I shall not permit any man to make and brand my Democracy. Nor shall I permit any number of men to dictate to me how I shall perform my duty to my constituents as United States Senator. To paraphrase the language of another, "While I breathe heaven's air and Heaven looks down on me and smiles at my best meaning, I remain master of mine own self," and shall control my own vote, particularly in this matter.

Mr. President, the times are not propitious; the clouds that overhang the sky cast a somber shadow. The sea of passion rolls high. No good can possibly come of quarreling. Crimination and recrimination will not promote solidarity in the Democratic ranks. Men can not be driven. Decent Senators can not be bought either with flattery or patronage. Bickerings promote disintegration. I have no desire to interfere with the honest thought, nor do I question the patriotism of any Senator in this Chamber. I would not be the keeper of his conscience. I would not be responsible for his performance of the duties of his place. He understands to whom he owes allegiance, and I am not going to be so uncharitable, so egotistical, so contemptible, vulgar, and indecent as to question the honesty and patriotism of his motives because he happens to differ from me. I believe that my position is right. I shall maintain it. I do not arrogate to myself infallibility. I realize that I have all the limitations that encompass about and beset other men. But—

"If I am right, Thy grace impart,  
Still in the right to stay;  
If I am wrong, O teach my heart  
To find the better way.

Teach me to feel another's woe,  
To hide the faults I see;  
That mercy I to others show,  
That mercy show to me."

Mr. JAMES. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. JAMES. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the beautiful composition upon the Roman Empire. I was wondering whether or not my genial friend the Senator from Mississippi, from that lofty pinnacle upon which he placed himself, could see such an insignificant object as the Senator from Missouri.

Whatever the Senator from Mississippi may say about the Senator from Missouri, he ought to recollect that that great Commonwealth has been more lavish with her honors upon him than any other one of her many illustrious sons. The fact of his election as governor, the fact that he was three times elected to Congress—twice elected to this body, and at the last election returned here by an unprecedented majority—is sufficient attestation to the character, aye, to the Democracy, of the Senator from Missouri, no matter from what quarter the assault upon him may come; and do not you know there is something about the conduct of the Senator from Missouri that warms my heart to him? So long honored by his party, reelected, with six years in front of him, he comes back and takes the same old Democratic sword in his hand, and does not get too big to fight the battles of the party that has honored him so long and so greatly. Mr. President, that is a lesson that would not be a bad one for some other Senators to follow.

My friend from Mississippi told us that we went to Republicans for recruits. Senator, there are two kinds of Republicans, just like there are two kinds of Democrats. The difference is this: You went to the standpatters, we went to the Progressives, for aid; but we did not do it until, like a shot from a subma-

rine fired upon our party, we found ourselves hopeless and helpless within our own ranks.

Why, sir, when Gorman and Smith, in the sad days of Cleveland's administration, sought to separate themselves from their party, they did not do it by ambush. They did not do it by sudden attack. They stood upon the floor of the Democratic caucus and sounded the alarm and gave the notice to the party that it might expect such an attack.

I want to say here and now that I believe in Democracy. I can not agree with some Senators in the announcement that has been made upon this floor that party obligations rest heavily upon the people from whom they seek their commission and rest lightly upon those who wear the senatorial toga.

I should not have risen upon this floor to discuss this bill, Mr. President, but for the fact that I find myself going one road and my colleague [Mr. CAMDEN] traveling another one.

The highest honor that the proud people of Kentucky can bestow upon one of her sons has been given to me, as to him. It was given to both of us by the Democratic Party of Kentucky; and as I love the banner of Democracy in Kentucky, and proudly bear her commission here given me by 300,000 brave Democrats, I shall not desert it now upon this floor.

What is the law in Kentucky about a primary election? And let me pause here to observe that a primary election in Kentucky is but another name for a caucus here. The only difference is that a caucus of Senators usually assembles at 8 o'clock and adjourns at 12. A Democratic primary is called under the law of our State, and the officers assembled to hold it, and the voters commence to cast their ballots at 6 o'clock and continue until 4.

When my friend Senator CAMDEN ran for the Senate, before he could run for that great office he had to be able under our law to say that at the last regular election he supported the nominees of the Democratic Party. But for that, under the law of Kentucky, his name could not have gone upon the ballot as a candidate for the Democratic nomination for Senator. A voter that comes to cast his ballot there must be able to state that at the last regular election he supported the Democratic ticket. More than that, Mr. President, he has to say that he will support the nominee of the Democratic primary, whether it is his own choice or his neighbor's choice. The Democratic Party's nominee then takes the banner, and he goes from one end of the State to the other appealing for support. The same rules and regulations apply to candidates for a Republican nomination. It is held under a State-wide primary law. But when, the other day, my friend the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CAMDEN], in colloquy with the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE], said, "I did not attend the Democratic caucus," that was no excuse.

Who would have heard a Kentucky Democrat say in the last election, when my friend was appealing for support as the nominee of his party, "I am not bound to support the nominee because I did not attend the primary election"? The question is, "Senator CAMDEN, why did you not attend the caucus? You were elected by the Democratic Party. You affiliated with the Democratic Party in Kentucky, and sought its honor and its nomination, and received election by reason of its votes"; and I insist that when he comes here he should associate himself with the party that honored him.

Why, Mr. President, at every Democratic national convention that assembles the Democrats are sent from the various States, and when they are sent there every man must sacrifice something. Why, gentlemen, we can not all have our way. No great law ever was written upon the statute books of this country by reason of the force or power of one individual. It is only the power of the collection of numbers, through great political parties. When the Democratic national convention was assembled the various States sent their representatives there, and they all considered the platform. They took a vote upon the question, and the majority ruled. While it takes two-thirds to nominate a candidate of the Democratic Party for President, a majority pronounces its faith and declares its platform.

Suppose a Kentucky Democrat should say, "Well, that platform does not suit me. I can not agree to everything in it. I want an amendment to it." Then here comes up another one, "I can not vote the Democratic ticket, because the platform does not meet my views. I want this amendment added to it." And here comes another Democrat and says, "I can not agree to the platform because I want to offer an amendment to it." The result would be, instead of a great, cohesive Democracy marching shoulder to shoulder against the serried ranks of a common enemy, that we would have 8,000,000 different Democratic Parties, and so the power of Democracy would die.

Mr. CAMDEN. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator for a moment?

Mr. JAMES. Certainly.

Mr. CAMDEN. Wherein the senior Senator from Kentucky and myself differ is that the platform does suit me. I came here and I conscientiously voted for and supported every Democratic measure. I have stated my reasons—that this shipping bill is not in the party platform.

Mr. JAMES. I am glad to know that we had one Democratic platform that suited the Senator.

Mr. CAMDEN. This suited me very well.

Mr. JAMES. How about the other platforms in 1896, 1900, and 1908? Did they suit the Senator?

Mr. CAMDEN. Mr. President, this is not germane to the subject, but I am very glad, indeed, to say that more people in Kentucky agreed with me about that platform than agreed with the senior Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. JAMES. Two hundred thousand of them were Republicans, however. [Laughter on the floor and in the galleries.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is not going to continue to be a megaphone for the benefit of the galleries. There is a rule of the Senate that the occupants of the galleries shall not interrupt by applause or otherwise. The Chair has been sitting here day after day and making that announcement. He is not going to do it again. The galleries will be cleared unless the occupants of the galleries obey the rule of the Senate.

Mr. JAMES. The answer of the Senator from Kentucky means this, that he voted with the enemies of Democracy in 1896, and they carried all the electors but one. Am I right? What about 1900? You did not vote with the majority then, nor did you vote with the majority in 1908, because Democracy triumphed in both elections in Kentucky.

But aside from that, you say you stand on this platform. I greet you with delight. What is there about this platform that in any way contravenes the question that is now at issue?

I thank God I belong to a party that in a great war, an emergency like this, is not hugging a technical delusion to our bosom in order that the sea may be made the subject of the piracy of a great trust and monopoly that was undertaking to rob all the consumers of the world.

But even more than that, Mr. President, my colleague, the Senator from Kentucky, I may say, is pledged to support this bill, and I believe that I can show it. It is a matter with him. What I am saying to him is emphatic and positive, not in anger. Great God, I am willing, in the name of the 300,000 Democrats in Kentucky, to put my arms around him and pray with him to come back into the Democratic Party. The Democracy of the mountains of Kentucky, across her waving blue grass, over the pennyroyal, and, through the purchase, on to the Mississippi River, are praying this day that the Senator from Kentucky will come back to the old Democratic household. Mr. President:

The moving finger writes; and having writ,  
Moves on; nor all your party nor wit  
Shall lure it back to cancel half a line,  
Nor all your tears wash out a word of it.

The junior Senator from Kentucky made a speech when he was running for the Senate, and I have it here. I will read from the Courier Journal of Thursday morning, October 27, 1914. Here it is:

The all-important question in the November election—

Said Senator CAMDEN—

The all-important question in the November election, said Senator CAMDEN, is not so much the personnel of the candidates for United States Senator "as it is whether the people will give Woodrow Wilson and the Democratic administration the encouragement of their indorsement by electing Democrats to assist and uphold the hands of the President in further carrying out his great program of constructive legislation."

The people in Kentucky thought that Senator CAMDEN meant by that that he was not only going to uphold his hands by speech but by vote in every way it was possible. But it seems like they were mistaken. What the Senator from Kentucky meant when he said he was going to hold up President Wilson's hands was that he was going to hold them up while the Republican Party tied them. [Laughter.] That is the Senator's own statement to the people in Kentucky—

Mr. CAMDEN. May I interrupt again?

Mr. JAMES. Certainly.

Mr. CAMDEN. Mr. President, there is nothing more misleading than a statement that is half true. If the Senator will go back several paragraphs he will find I said that we will aid the President on the party platform pledges.

Mr. JAMES. Oh, Mr. President, I have no sort of objection to going back just as far as the Senator will have me go and quote all of it. It is a speech of a column and a half.

Mr. CAMDEN. All right, sir.

Mr. JAMES. If there is anything in it the Senator said that qualifies in any way what I have quoted I shall gladly put it in the Record.

Mr. CAMDEN. I will state that I did not pretend to indorse everything the President said, because, if I mistake not, somebody at one time wanted to knock somebody else into a cocked hat.

Mr. JAMES. Yes; and the Democrats of Kentucky are going to knock somebody else into a cocked hat, too, when they get a chance. [Laughter on the floor and in the galleries.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. Just one moment. The Chair is compelled to enforce silence in the galleries by the rules of the Senate. The Chair is also in duty bound by the rules of the Senate to preserve order in the Senate Chamber.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. President, I am perfectly happy to go back and read if the Senator will only indicate where I shall read. Senator CAMDEN discusses the Federal reserve act, and he says:

Senator CAMDEN discussed the Federal reserve act, which, he said, "stands out as possibly of more vital importance in the country than even the passage of the downward-revised tariff bill," and to which he referred as an "unspeakable blessing to the country at large" and "especially helpful to agriculture."

In strong terms the Speaker praised President Wilson's foreign policy, saying that if, when assailed by a pitiless storm of criticism and abuse, the President had been less courageous and less firm in his conviction of what a strong and powerful nation's duty toward a weak and distracted one was, we would be engaged in a bloody conflict, the end of which could not be seen, with both continents plunged in war. "Don't you know," said he, "that we owe it to Wilson that we are permitted now to have the inspiring vision of this great country towering sublimely above the clouds of war that encompass despairing nations, and that the standard of Democratic civilization has been placed upon high and unassailable ground?"

Why, then, Mr. President, it seems the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CAMDEN] had great confidence in the President of the United States. That was the one name to be conjured with in Kentucky. The Wilson banner was the one flag that everybody wanted to bear. The Senator said that he would uphold the President and the Democracy of Kentucky if he were elected into a seat in this body.

Mr. CAMDEN. May I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. JAMES. Certainly.

Mr. CAMDEN. I should like to ask the Senator whether he voted with the President in 1896.

Mr. JAMES. I voted with the Democratic Party then as I am voting with the Democratic Party now.

Mr. CAMDEN. But with the President?

Mr. JAMES. That is a matter you will have to settle with the President. I voted with the Democratic Party. The Democratic Party to me is greater than any man in the Nation though he occupies the lofty station of President. But at the time the Senator from Kentucky told the people that if elected here he would uphold the hands of President Wilson in enacting into law his great constructive policy, the one thing that stood out like a column of light, that the President was advocating at that time, was the shipping bill. I have here before me an interview which was published in all the papers of the country, which I shall put in the RECORD, where the President, September 24, 1914, and also September 28, 1914, nearly a month before the speech of Senator CAMDEN was delivered, stated that he was urging the passage of the shipping bill, and he was going to insist upon it when Congress reconvened in December:

[From newspaper interview with the President, Thursday, September 24, 1914.]

Does the ship-purchasing bill remain a part of the legislative program or has there been an agreement to defer action?

The PRESIDENT. It remains a part of the program. I think it is very necessary in order to handle things that private enterprise can not be expected to be asked to handle.

Do the number of applications for registry under the ship-registry law come up to the expectations of the administration?

The PRESIDENT. I have not even inquired about that. Have you been informed of any disinclination on the part of the House?

The PRESIDENT. I have heard of the opposition of individual Members.

[From interview, September 28, 1914.]

Mr. President, with reference to the shipping bill, do you share the general feeling that the urgency is passed?

The PRESIDENT. No; not in the least. The urgency has increased.

Mr. President, Judge ALEXANDER said Saturday that his advices were that the emergency for it was over; that there were plenty of ships for it.

The PRESIDENT. For the ordinary trade, yes; but that is not what it is for. It is chiefly for the development of American trade where it will be unprofitable for private capital to develop it and where I know for a certainty that private capital will not develop it. It could not be expected to.

Mr. President, you told us last week that the opposition to the bill was rather negligible.

The PRESIDENT. So I was then informed.

Do you not think that it has grown?

The PRESIDENT. Apparently it has. I do not know whether it is apparently or really. You know a few persons can make a great deal

of noise sometimes, particularly a few persons who are interested from an investment point of view.

Does that alter your views or position any?

The PRESIDENT. No, sir; because the circumstances are not altered. Opposition does not alter me; circumstances, I hope, do.

Mr. President, is not that opposition chiefly toward taking it up at the present time rather than toward the proposition?

The PRESIDENT. That may be. I do not know. I am going to confer with some of the Members of the House just as soon as I can find space on my calendar. I will find that out; that may be all there is in it.

Can you say anything of the visit of Mr. ALEXANDER or Mr. UNDERWOOD to-day?

The PRESIDENT. That is about that subject.

Your present judgment is, Mr. President, that it ought to pass at this session of Congress?

The PRESIDENT. Unless I learn something that changes my judgment in the matter. I do not mean something about the opposition to it, but something about the urgency.

Mr. President, if the day shall ever come, which God forbid, that I no longer can affiliate with the great party that has honored me with their commission here, I shall have the courage at least, and the honor at most, to tender back to the brave Democracy that honored me the commission I accepted, to the end that they may send some one here who can fight their battles, speak their language, and cast their votes.

Mr. CAMDEN. Let me again interrupt the Senator.

Mr. JAMES. Certainly.

Mr. CAMDEN. It seems to me that the people of Kentucky have passed upon my election. If I am not mistaken I received a larger popular vote than you ever did.

Mr. JAMES. Than I did?

Mr. CAMDEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. JAMES. The Senator knows when I ran for the Senate I was nominated in the popular primary and got over 100,000 more votes than the other man's name who was on the ticket received. He had even withdrawn, but his name still remained on the ballot. How many votes did the Senator get? You never got 100,000 majority nor anything that in any way approached it. So that much of this dispute seems to me to be well understood.

Mr. President, I listened to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK]. I served with him for 10 years in the House. He is a brilliant Democrat, at least he was when he spoke in the House on March 27. I want to read you how he goes after a bolter when he thinks he is one. On page 5957 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 27, 1914, they had under consideration the tolls bill. Of course, there had been no caucus on that measure in the House. The Speaker of the House, Mr. CLARK—CHAMP CLARK—took an opposite view of that question from the President. Not being bound by party caucus in the House to take another view or to yield his judgment to the will of the majority of the party he made his speech there. He let it be understood that he was going to speak on it and that he was going to take that position. Let me show you the handsome fashion in which my friend the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] trimmed him up:

"Oh," they say, "you have not given to us a reasonable opportunity for amendment." I say we have given you full, ample opportunity—all the opportunity that this question requires. [Laughter.] Oh, gentlemen, possess your souls in patience. This is not a tariff bill with 4,000 items that might be raised or lowered. This is not a currency bill with many and difficult and complex provisions that might be changed. This is not an appropriation bill with hundreds and thousands of items that might be increased or decreased. This is a plain, simple proposition: Shall we give these American ships this exemption or not? And we can answer that question "yes" or "no." There is no need of dodging; there is no need of evading it; there is no need of amendment. Let this Congress answer "yes" or "no." Will you stand by this great Democratic President in his plea for the national honor? Yes or no? Under which flag will you fight? Will you fight under the flag of these gentlemen, who assail their own party leadership and desert their own administration?

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President—

Mr. JAMES. I gladly yield to the Senator.

Mr. HARDWICK. The men to whom I had special reference on that occasion in the speech from which the Senator quotes did not claim to be acting under the instructions of a caucus nor in accordance with the principles of the party or the belief that the proposition was a fundamental tenet of Democracy, as I understand.

Mr. JAMES. I am not familiar—

Mr. HARDWICK. Nor, if the Senator will let me add one word—

Mr. JAMES. Certainly.

Mr. HARDWICK. Nor on any constitutional ground did we have any doubt or political differences. If the Senator from Kentucky had listened to the few remarks I submitted to-day, he would know that I still entertain the same high regard for our great Democratic President who sits in the White House that I have ever had, and it is a matter of regret that from my constitutional view and my sense of what is absolutely right I can not support him in this matter. I would not impute improper motives to them under any circumstances, and I cer-

tainly would not attempt to criticize them for their own independence, and, if my language can be so construed, I freely confess now I do not recall it.

Mr. JAMES. I am not through reading this.

Mr. HARDWICK. Read it all.

Mr. JAMES (reading)—

Let this Congress answer "yes" or "no." Will you stand by this great Democratic President in his plea for the national honor? Yes or no? Under which flag will you fight? Will you fight under the flag of these gentlemen—

Not seven; I do not know the number—

who assail their own party leadership and desert their own administration, stabbing it in the back without a moment's notice and without an instant's warning, or will you follow that glorious Democrat from New Jersey who has made this country its greatest President since the days of Thomas Jefferson? [Applause.]

Senator HARDWICK, that is one of the ablest speeches you ever made. [Laughter.] Of course, I can understand, and I question no Senator's motives. You put it on the ground of conscience. A man named Shakespeare once said, "Conscience doth make cowards of us all," and now an additional sin is added to it, it makes bolters of some. But every Senator at last must explain his own acts to the people, and they alone can judge. I am perfectly willing that my acts shall be subjected to their final judgment.

But of all things most surprising to me is that when our Democratic friends went into this alliance with the Republicans they did not give us a chance, as my friend Senator HUGHES said, to get the women and children off the ship before they submarined it. The days of auld lang syne would at least have entitled us to that right, if nothing more.

And as to the other side, the Republicans—with what delight I saw them coming over here! When I would see them get up to one of the seven Senators who had left our party and get their arms around him and get to whispering sweet things into his ear and then go off smiling and wink the other eye I knew they could see indeed visions of two years' advance of the old fleshpots. They could hear coming back the same old brigade. They could see the same old standpatters in control. Yes; and our friends upon the other side of course felt delighted. I do not blame them. There is nothing on earth that is as dear to the Republican side, the standpat Republican view, as an idle man except a bolting Democrat. [Laughter.]

But this bill, Mr. President, what about that? Who are the gentlemen who filibustered here for days and days, speaking 13 and 14 hours at a time? They are Republicans. They are the same men who advocated a ship subsidy. To do what? Not to build ships to be operated by the Government of the United States in order to make rates reasonable, in order to deliver the products of the farmer, the merchant, and of the manufacturer to people abroad. They were willing to take \$9,000,000 a year of the people's money out of the Treasury and do what with it? To put it into the pockets of the Shipping Trust that is at this very hour robbing in a conscienceless way every single shipper in the United States who wants to send anything to the other side. If you had given them that subsidy then, which the Democratic Party prevented you from doing, they would have been robbing in the same old way as they are to-day. Even our working people, the toiling millions, the school children, are giving of their mite to send food and other supplies abroad to suffering people, but when they go to the dock to put them on the ship it is standing there, this conscienceless monopoly, that says, "No; though you gathered from the humble walks of life, yet we must have a freight rate in order to take it abroad that is not only oppressive but practically confiscatory."

I know that our Republican friends, of course, do not want this bill to pass, and why? To-day, when half the world is on fire, the greatest war in all the history of mankind, our factories and our people have more orders than ever before. We want to fill those orders. We want the laboring people to be employed. You gentlemen are doing in this contest what you have done all during the Sixty-third Congress. You are seeking to keep this Government from returning to prosperity, because you know that when it does return to prosperity your day and your hope are passed.

It even commenced, Mr. President, when we were considering the tariff bill. Day after day these gentlemen would put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which it will show, clipping after clipping from newspapers showing that somebody was out of work, that some factory was going to shut down. What a delight it was to them. But the standpat Republican does not live who can point to a single article that he put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD showing returning prosperity, or the employment of people, or of great orders being placed with the manufacturers of the United States.

Of course, you Republicans are not for this bill. You know that when it passes the factories will commence to hum; you know that you can find no idle men; you know that the farmers' products will go abroad; you know that this country will bloom and blossom with prosperity never known before. It is no wonder that you filibustered all night long, and put up your great leader, Mr. SMOOT, to break the record in a 13-hour speech. You are fighting for the life of the Republican Party.

They say that it will bring war. When did you get that idea? For almost two years I have heard the Republicans on the other side rise and assail the President of the United States for his "watchful waiting." How you sneered at him! How you said he was a weakling! How you talked about Mexico, Mexico. But the President, the greatest advocate of peace who has appeared upon this earth since the Prince of Peace stood at the Sea of Galilee, prevented his country from going to war. And now what is the matter? We have not ships to send our products abroad, because you are afraid that this man who stood for peace even under your bitter attack after attack will do what? Force the country into war.

You know the war they are afraid of, Mr. President. The war that the Shipping Trust is afraid of is not a war between countries; it is a war upon their outrageous and confiscatory rates upon the American shippers, the farmers of this land, the manufacturers of this Nation. That is the war they are alarmed about.

But let us see about that. You do not believe that President Wilson would force the country into a war. You will have an opportunity to vote for amendments putting that even beyond all possible doubt. My friend from Kentucky, Senator CAMDEN, gives in his speech his idea about this thing, and I want to read it in order to be accurate:

Democratic Senators, I solemnly warn you that it is madness to push this bill to embark our Government upon this perilous and uncharted business sea. Does not Britain well know that if one of this country's boats should be sunk by a floating mine—in an accidental way—we might say, then, we would not only be feeding Britain, but we would find ourselves fighting for her, which she well knows.

Now, the idea that because one of our vessels was over there close to Liverpool, and by accident, as Senator CAMDEN says, should be destroyed, that this Government should go to war for Great Britain! Gentleman, just to state that, just to read it, is to show the weakness to which men are driven in order to make some criticism of this bill.

Mr. President, this Government would not go to war because one of our vessels was accidentally sunken. Not at all. This great Government here would not do for itself, for all the people, of this great Government what it would be unwilling to do for the humblest citizen in the land. This Government would no more quickly go to war in order to resent an injury done to a vessel owned by itself than it would go to war to resent an injury done to a vessel owned by the humblest sailor who is upon the sea. If it would, it is unworthy to be a government of all the people. The injury of one is the concern of all. If Senator CAMDEN's fear is to be dissipated, we would have to call to port every ship we have upon the sea at this time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. JAMES. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Does not the bill itself say in so many words that these ships—

The VICE PRESIDENT. There must be some way whereby the reporters can get the statements or inquiries of Senators.

Mr. GALLINGER. I was about to raise the point of order that Senators seem to have colloquies between themselves and do not face the Chair.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Does not the bill itself say that these ships shall be subject to the liabilities and shall enjoy the advantages of the ships of private citizens of the United States? In substance, is not that the express provision of the bill?

Mr. JAMES. Oh, certainly. Of course, the suggestion of war is ridiculous; but let us see.

My friend from Kentucky [Mr. CAMDEN] said that he sold his wheat and his cattle at better prices than ever before. Well, I am happy to know that; but there are other farmers in Kentucky, Mr. President, beside those who own fine herds and a great amount of wheat. The great money crop in Kentucky is tobacco. What about that? Tobacco to-day is selling for nothing, or it is hardly selling at all. The tobacco planters in my section of the country are unable to get more than five and six dollars per hundred for the dark tobacco. That tobacco is a great export tobacco. It is shipped abroad. It is sold in my section to the buyers from France, from Germany, from Austria, from England, and from all the rest of the world. What has been

the effect upon tobacco? The farmers of Kentucky want to know. I want to read to the Senate a letter upon that question:

BALTIMORE, MD., December 26, 1914.  
The DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,  
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: Responding to your request for proofs of how shipments of American goods to Europe are handicapped or made entirely prohibitive on account of high ocean freight rates, we beg to submit the following:

We are shippers of Maryland, Ohio, Kentucky, and Virginia tobacco to Europe, and most of our shipments are consigned to Holland, Germany, Austria, Italy, Norway, and Belgium. At present only shipments to Holland, Italy, and Norway are possible at prohibitive rates. In fact, the latter have become so high that now cable orders "Stop buying" have been received.

Although we have made a yearly contract with the Holland-American Line—the only shipping opportunity from here to Holland—as per copy inclosed, this line has arbitrarily raised its rates 100 to 300 per cent, and even at the raised rates shipments can be booked only "for first available room."

Rates to Italy also have become entirely too high—i. e., from \$4 per hoghead of Maryland tobacco to about \$27, or nearly 3½ cents a pound—so that tobacco shipments have become out of question.

The Holland-American Line, which raised the rates on December 7, 1914, has now again suspended them, indicating another raise.

Trusting that the foregoing statement will interest you, we are, dear sirs,

Very respectfully,

J. D. KREMLBERG & CO.

Our people in Kentucky have their great tobacco crop practically unsold. Some Senators here say, "Well, you can not get the ships in time to ship this crop." Well, if we can not get them in time to ship this crop, let us get them in time to ship the next crop. Who knows how long this war will last? No one. Here is the freight rate upon the great money crop of my State, upon the great tobacco farmers, as patriotic and splendid a class of people as live in the world, who stood by me and have been my friends, and the rate has been raised upon their tobacco 700 per cent. I can not find it in my heart to stand upon this floor and fail to express what I know is their desire and their hope of this American Congress. I now read from page 15 of this document by Secretary McAdoo, which is a complete and powerful analysis of the whole situation:

#### BURDEN UPON AMERICAN BUSINESS.

Annexed hereto, as Exhibit 1, is a summary of our sea trade and the estimated freight cost of handling it from July to December, 1914, inclusive, prepared by the actuary of the Treasury Department.

From this it appears that our total exports by sea for July, 1914 (before the war), were \$139,225,479, and the ocean freight cost was \$7,833,482, or 5.63 per cent; the total of such exports for December, 1914, were \$226,000,000 (estimated), and the ocean freight cost was \$30,742,500, or 13.6 per cent—an increase over July of 141 per cent.

If the ocean freight cost on December exports had been at the same rate as July, viz, 5.63 per cent, the total freight charge on our exports for December would have been \$12,723,800 instead of \$30,742,500. In other words, the increased ocean freight tax arbitrarily imposed upon our farmers and business men for the month of December, 1914, only was \$18,018,700. If exports by sea continue for the 12 months of 1915 at the December, 1914, rate and the ocean freight charges are the same as for December, 1914, the American farmers and business men will pay to shipowners (principally foreign) increased freight charges above the normal rate of \$216,224,400, or more than five times the \$40,000,000 which the Government proposes by the shipping bill to put into American ships for the protection of our foreign commerce.

In two months and seven days the increased ocean freight charges (above the normal rates prevailing in July, 1914) exacted on our foreign trade at the December, 1914, rate would amount to \$40,241,761, or more than the total amount, viz, \$40,000,000, which the shipping bill authorizes for investment in an American merchant marine.

In 12 months, as before stated, the total increase in the freight tax levied by steamship owners, mostly foreign, upon our export trade, at the December, 1914, rate would amount to the sum of \$216,224,400. If the same be applied to our import trade, there would be an additional increase of \$95,640,000, or a total increased ocean freight charge on exports and imports by sea in one year of \$311,864,400, or 141.6 per cent over the usual cost. (See Exhibit 2.)

Thus far we have been dealing only with the increased ocean freight charges over and above the normal rates prevailing in July, 1914. Including these normal rates, and assuming that the December, 1914, total ocean freight charges, viz, \$44,342,500, represent an average for each month of 1915, the total ocean freight charges on American import and export trade by sea for the year 1915 would amount to the enormous total of \$532,110,000. (See Exhibit 1.) Almost the whole of this huge sum would be paid to foreign steamship owners and would have an important bearing upon our foreign trade balances; it might, in fact, turn these balances against us.

#### MAXIMUM NOT IN SIGHT.

While this report is being written information is received that rates are higher than those given in some of the tables herein presented, and that even at these extraordinary figures it is difficult to obtain cargo space for earlier sailings than March and April.

#### SUMMARY OF THE MOST STRIKING INCREASES.

From the foregoing tables it will be observed that ocean freight rates on grain from New York to Rotterdam have been increased since the outbreak of the war 900 per cent; on flour, 500 per cent; on cotton, 700 per cent.

From New York to Liverpool the rates on the same commodities have increased from 300 to 500 per cent.

From Baltimore to European ports (excepting German) rates have been increased on grain 900 per cent; on flour, 364 per cent; on cotton, 614 per cent.

From Norfolk to Liverpool rates on grain have been increased from 157 to 200 per cent; on cotton, 186 per cent.

From Norfolk to Rotterdam the rates on cotton have been increased 471 per cent; to Bremen the rates have increased on cotton 1,100 per cent, namely, from \$1.25 per bale to \$15 per bale.

From Savannah to Liverpool the rates have been increased on cotton 250 per cent; to Bremen the rates have been increased on cotton 900 per cent.

From Galveston to Liverpool the rates have been increased on grain 174 per cent; on cotton, 361 per cent; to Bremen the rates have been increased on cotton 1,061 to 1,150 per cent.

#### CONTROL OF RATE SITUATION BY STEAMSHIP INTERESTS.

Ocean freight rates are still rising, and are limited only by the greed of the steamship owners on the one hand and by what the traffic can stand on the other.

The Government has no power to control or regulate ocean freight rates. It can not under existing law protect our foreign trade against these extortionate and hurtful charges. The steamship owners can increase rates without notice and upon the instant, and our business men are helpless. The steamship companies are their own masters and do as they please with the transportation of our exports. As already shown, they are seriously checking our foreign trade, and in some cases, such as lumber and coal, are stopping it altogether.

What is another objection urged here? That it may lead to Government ownership. That is a great bugaboo that the Shipping Trust gets up—Government ownership! Mr. President, we can regulate our railroad rates; we can regulate every other business in the United States; but the one thing we can not regulate is the over-seas traffic charges, because these ships are owned by foreigners—the foreign trust is not under our jurisdiction. Every shipper, every farmer, every manufacturer of this Nation is subject to whatever the foreign monopolists seek to lay upon the citizen of this land who wants to ship his product abroad. In addition to that, some of these gentlemen say that Government ownership of this line in this great emergency and condition that no man could foresee will finally lead to Government ownership everywhere.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, will it disturb the Senator from Kentucky if I interrupt him just there?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. JAMES. I do.

Mr. HARDWICK. The Senator from Kentucky has suggested that the Congress of the United States has no power to protect the domestic shippers against these foreign combines. The Senator doubtless remembers the legislation we passed providing for the safety of life at sea, by which we refused to allow a ship to clear from one of our ports or to enter our ports until it had been equipped with certain paraphernalia—lifeboats, and so forth. Have we not got the same power to provide that no ship shall enter or clear from ports of the United States unless it charges not more than certain freight rates, and to regulate the matter in that way?

Mr. JAMES. I do not believe the Government of the United States has a right to regulate foreign ships or to say what charges they may lay upon shippers; but, of course, the Senator from Georgia, I take it, is one of those who are afraid of foreign complications. I should imagine that there would be nothing that would more quickly subject us to trouble with a foreign Government than an undertaking of that sort.

Mr. HARDWICK. If the Senator will pardon me, there is not the slightest danger of that.

Mr. JAMES. I am willing, then, to do that if we can do it; but let us do something. Do not let us stand here and say we can do this and that, but let us do it if we can. We have got this bill up now, and let us do this; and then, if we can do what you desire, we shall do that also.

But our friends say, and the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CAMDEN] declared, that the Government is incapable of handling anything; that it would not make a success of it. That is not the record nor the history of our Government. We manage the operation of a Navy costing hundreds of millions of dollars, and we do it successfully. We managed the construction of the Panama Canal at an expenditure of \$400,000,000, and did it with great success and to the pride of every American citizen. There was no favoritism shown there, and no charge of it; there was no political manipulation of offices there, and there was no charge of it.

But, oh, the Shipping Trust! Whenever you try to engage in the business in which they have got a monopoly, the cry is raised that you have not got the skill to do it; that you will allow political favoritism to creep into it; you will have to go to the Treasury to reimburse yourselves for the great loss that will fall upon the people of the United States. Whenever we undertake to establish competition to the great monopoly that now holds the American people by the throat, that is urged. Well, let us see. I read, Mr. President, a letter from the president of the Panama Canal Co. That company is owned by the Government of the United States. It operates a line of ships and has been operating them for several years now. Let us see what has been the effect of that:

Up to May 31, 1914, we have charged up \$358,653.35 to the depreciation of steamers owned by our company; we have maintained a rate of \$3.50 for rough goods between New York and Colon and \$4.50

per ton on general cargo, as against the \$8 rate in effect previous to the time the Government assumed control of our company—

Now, here is a case where, when the Government took control of these ships, the rate charged was \$8 per ton, and it forced its competitors to come down to the price the Government was hauling freight for—

and as against a rate of \$6 that is now being charged by steamship lines operating vessels between New York and ports contiguous to the Canal Zone; we have carried thousands of employees of the Government and their families from New York to the Canal Zone at the \$20 and \$30 rates, as against the \$75 rate prevailing by other steamship lines; we have competed with foreign lines for the freight traffic moving between New York and ports on the Pacific coast both north and south of Panama, without being parties to rebates, reduced freight rates, or concessions in passenger fares to the important shippers interested in this traffic; we have assisted in the development of traffic between the Atlantic and Pacific coasts of the United States as against the transcontinental railroads by allowing steamship co-carriers on the Pacific a proportion of the through rates sufficiently remunerative to enable them to maintain their steamers in the traffic and accepting a proportion for our Atlantic haul that in most cases result in a loss to our line; we have by the operation of our steamship line induced our Pacific Ocean carriers to agree to a gradual reduction in the rates to and from the United States and Pacific ports of Mexico, Central and South America, to the level of the rates to and from Europe, thereby doing away with the discrimination that has for years existed in favor of the European market; by our action in maintaining low and yet reasonable rates between New York and the Canal Zone we have saved the Government very considerable money in the shipments that have been forwarded by other lines that were forced to meet our rates, and notwithstanding all this the operation of the steamship line has been financially successful, as you will note by the following table:

	Profits.	Deficits.
1905.....	\$157,245.49	
1906.....		\$37,158.21
1907.....	158,562.95	
1908.....		178,810.67
1909.....	104,995.98	
1910.....	167,952.25	
1911.....	77,187.97	
1912.....		201,761.13
1913.....	221,489.92	
11 months to May 31, 1914.....	267,019.29	
Total.....	1,154,453.85	418,730.01

I shall print all of the letter in the RECORD, Mr. President, with the consent of the Senate, but I shall not take the time of the Senate to read all of it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, permission to do so is granted.

The entire letter referred to is as follows:

PANAMA RAILROAD CO.,  
New York, September 15, 1914.

HON. J. W. BRYAN,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BRYAN: Your letter of the 5th instant has just been received by me.

When the United States Government secured control of our company we were operating a steamship line between New York and Colon as a feeder for the railroad. It consisted of the steamships *Alliance*, *Advance*, and *Finance*, which were owned by the company, together with other chartered steamers that were secured from time to time, as warranted by the traffic.

The maximum freight rate then existing between New York and Colon was \$8 per ton, and outside of a few of our employees, who were carried at lower rates, the prevailing fare for passengers was \$75 each way.

The three steamers we had in the service were not, of course, of sufficient capacity to meet the demands for transportation of freight and passengers when the construction of the canal was commenced, and the Isthmian Canal Commission, the department of the Government in charge of the work, purchased the steamships *Colon* and *Panama* from the Ward Line and turned them over to us for operation on the basis of our company paying interest, charter hire, and depreciation.

The minimum freight rate was gradually reduced from \$8 to \$3.50 per ton, and is still effective, and practically all of our passenger accommodations have been availed of for the transportation of Government employees. These demands have been so urgent that we have not been able to accommodate the tariff passengers desiring to sail on our steamers, who have consequently patronized the other lines running between New York and the Canal Zone.

When the steamships *Ancon* and *Cristobal* were purchased for the transportation of cement to the Canal Zone, they were turned over to us without charter expense, because it was realized that any charge of this character assessed against us would be reflected in the rate established for the transportation of cement; and with a view to reducing this to the lowest possible limit, we were relieved from the obligation of paying charter hire for the steamships *Colon* and *Panama* upon the understanding that cement would be carried on the *Ancon* and *Cristobal* at actual cost, and that in arriving at this cost we would credit the Panama Canal with the amount we would pay for the charter of the steamships *Colon* and *Panama*. As a result of this arrangement all of the cement carried by our steamers in connection with the construction of the canal has been burdened with a transportation charge of only \$1.25 per ton of 2,000 pounds, while on tramp steamers that we have been obliged to charter from time to time because our steamers were not of sufficient capacity to carry all of the cement needed in the work, the Government has incurred an expense of from \$2.25 to \$3 per ton of 2,240 pounds.

Up to the middle of August, when we turned over the steamship *Cristobal* to the Quartermaster's Department for the return of American tourists in Europe, we were operating six steamers—the *Ancon* and *Cristobal*, the *Colon* and *Panama*, and the *Alliance* and *Advance*. The

last two are the property of our company, the *Finance* having been lost in New York Harbor about four years ago.

Up to May 31, 1914, we have charged up \$358,653.35 to the depreciation of steamers owned by our company; we have maintained a rate of \$3.50 for rough goods between New York and Colon, and \$4.50 per ton on general cargo, as against the \$8 rate in effect previous to the time the Government assumed control of our company, and as against a rate of \$6 that is now being charged by steamship lines operating vessels between New York and ports contiguous to the Canal Zone; we have carried thousands of employees of the Government and their families from New York to the Canal Zone at the \$20 and \$30 rates, as against the \$75 rate prevailing by other steamship lines; we have competed with foreign lines for the freight traffic moving between New York and ports on the Pacific coast both north and south of Panama, without being parties to rebates, reduced freight rates, or concessions in passenger fares to the important shippers interested in this traffic; we have assisted in the development of traffic between the Atlantic and Pacific coasts of the United States as against the transcontinental railroads by allowing steamship co-carriers on the Pacific a proportion of the through rates sufficiently remunerative to enable them to maintain their steamers in the traffic and accepting a proportion for our Atlantic haul that in most cases results in a loss to our line; we have by the operation of our steamship line induced our Pacific Ocean carriers to agree to a gradual reduction in the rates to and from the United States and Pacific ports of Mexico, Central and South America, to the level of the rates to and from Europe, thereby doing away with the discrimination that has for years existed in favor of the European market; by our action in maintaining low and yet reasonable rates between New York and the Canal Zone we have saved the Government very considerable money in the shipments that have been forwarded by other lines that were forced to meet our rates, and notwithstanding all this the operations of the steamship line have been financially successful, as you will note by the following table:

	Profits.	Deficits.
1905.....	\$157,245.49	
1906.....		\$37,158.21
1907.....	158,562.95	
1908.....		178,810.67
1909.....	104,995.98	
1910.....	167,952.25	
1911.....	77,187.97	
1912.....		201,761.13
1913.....	221,489.92	
11 months to May 31, 1914.....	267,019.29	
Total.....	1,154,453.85	418,730.01

I believe the above will give you in a concise manner the result of the operation of our steamship line since its control by the Government, but if there are any further details that you require regarding expenses, earnings, charter, depreciation, or anything else that you think would be of any interest to you, I shall be very glad to furnish them to you.

Yours, very truly,

E. A. DRAKE, Vice President.

MR. JAMES. So, Mr. President, in the light of this letter, what becomes of the argument that we have heard here that the Government can not operate anything successfully? The Government has operated the Panama steamship line successfully and is doing so now, and the Government would operate the lines proposed under this bill successfully.

MR. PRESIDENT, of course many objections can be raised to legislation of this character. There is no trouble to find fault; but the thing in which we are most interested now is not to try to find fault, but to try to find some remedy. The Democratic Party is in control of this Government. The people look to us for relief. Not a single one of the great laws recently put on the statute books would have been written but for party action. Now shall Democrats here, in control of the Senate, in control of the House of Representatives, and with a Democrat in the White House, fail to meet this great emergency and give relief to the people of the United States of America?

Why, Mr. President, the rate upon cotton has increased from \$1.25 a bale, they tell me, to \$30 a bale. The cotton crop has not been sold to any great extent. The passage of this bill will give us 80 ships. In addition to that, the bill provides that the auxiliaries of the Navy which are not being used, which are now idle, shall be brought into this service. There are 40 of those vessels, making 120 in all, that we can employ at our various ports in the work of transporting abroad the tobacco and cotton of our farmers and the goods of our manufacturers. Why not take advantage of that opportunity? Why be prevented from giving this relief by a cry that you fear something that in no way has come to us when we have operated other ships, and have been doing it for 10 long years, as in the case of the line from New York to Panama?

In regard to the caucus, there is one caucus everybody attends, and that is the caucus called to give out committee assignments and patronage. No Senator stays away from that; nobody bolts that; that is when we are to get something. Now, when we have a chance to give the people back home something, let us all stick together just like we do when we are seeking something for ourselves.

When there were many Americans stranded abroad—and they were over there enjoying the delights of the Old World—we sent ships over there after them; we sent money over there

to bring them back home. They were stranded. The Kentucky farmer with his tobacco, the cotton farmer down South, and the manufacturer of this land with his products are stranded now. Let us afford them some relief, too. They do not ask you to send money over there to aid them; but they are stranded, just as many of the rich Americans abroad at the time of the outbreak of the war were stranded. They were worth their millions, but they could not get a dollar, just like our farmers have got their hogshead upon hogshead of tobacco and their bale upon bale of cotton, but can not sell it for the price of production, and the manufacturers of this land, with their thousand upon thousand of orders from all the world. They are stranded. Do not let us make flesh of one and fowl of the other.

When we sent ships abroad that gave this relief, it did not call forth the great cry of Government ownership.

Why, Mr. President, the fact is that when these Senators cry out that this bill will be a failure, that is exactly what the Shipping Trust does not believe. If they did, they would be for this bill more strongly than I am. If I could assure Wall Street that this measure would result in a failure and loss to the people of the United States, I could raise \$20,000,000 to-morrow in order to aid in the passage of this bill, but that is the very thing they do not believe. What they fear is that it will be a great success; they are afraid that it will drive monopoly off the sea and free the ocean from its piracy. That is what they are afraid of—nothing more.

Mr. President, the people of this country are aroused to the great importance of this issue. The people of Kentucky are aroused. They are for this measure, and they want to see it passed.

To my Democratic friends who have seen proper to bolt their party caucus, to refuse to act with their party after it has registered its decree, I am here to beg them to return to the Democratic Party. Come back. "There is a vacant chair awaiting there; arise and say you will come." It is the party that has honored you; it is the party that has lived for more than a hundred and thirty years; and it is a party so great that no man and no set of men with their betrayal can destroy it. It will live on. I beg these Senators to remember that the smiles upon the other side of this Chamber would not play across their countenances if it were not for the fact that they see in this breach between the Democrats upon this side their only hope of success.

I am not going to be unkind or going to say bitter things to any of the Democratic Senators who have left our party on this question, because I can see plainly written across their once smiling countenances the furrows of regret, and whenever they have further time to think of this question they will come back, I hope, to the Democratic Party.

But, Mr. President, above everything, if this bill must go down, if this great constructive measure must fail, if this must be the first defeat for the greatest President who has occupied that chair in 50 years, if he must fall and above his body the wild shouts of a triumphant Republican Party shall rise, I do pray God that I may be spared the humiliation of reaching down to pull from his body a dagger bearing the impress of the hand of a Kentucky Senator.

RECESS.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I move that the Senate take a recess until Monday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, February 8, 1915, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, February 5, 1915.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father who art in heaven, once more in faith and confidence we approach Thee in prayer. Make us, we beseech Thee, tractable; that we may be led by the holy spirit of truth to a faithful and conscientious disposition of every duty devolving upon us, so that when we are called upon to leave this existence men shall rise up and call us blessed, and, above all, that we may have Thine approval, which will be more blessed than all things else. This we ask in the name of Him who taught us faith, virtue, love, and good will to all men. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

### MILITARY ACADEMY BILL.

Mr. HAY, chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, by direction of that committee, reported the bill (H. R. 21328) making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and for other purposes, which was read a first and second time and, with accompanying papers, ordered printed and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union. (H. Rept. 1369.)

Mr. MANN reserved all points of order on the bill.

### NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 20975, the naval appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the naval appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. HAY in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the naval appropriation bill, of which the Clerk will read the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 20975) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and for other purposes.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee a question. I have no desire to make any speech in a general way. I am going to offer a substitute for a paragraph in the bill, and I would like to ask whether it is contemplated that there will be any extra time devoted to debate more than is allowed ordinarily under the five-minute rule? I am not asking for it, but it was done, I think, a year or two years ago.

Mr. PADGETT. The practice has varied somewhat. Sometimes there has been a little debate, and then a liberal discussion under the five-minute rule. I have no desire to hold down hard and fast under the rule, but I am willing to allow a liberal debate under the five-minute rule.

Mr. SLAYDEN. That is perfectly satisfactory to me.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will proceed with the reading of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

### INCREASE OF THE NAVY.

That for the purpose of further increasing the Naval Establishment of the United States the President is hereby authorized to have constructed two first-class battleships, carrying as heavy armor and as powerful armament as any vessel of their class, to have the highest practicable speed and greatest desirable radius of action, and to cost, exclusive of armor and armament, not to exceed \$7,800,000 each.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute for the paragraph that has just been read.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment to strike out the word "two" and insert the word "four."

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. SLAYDEN: On page 64 of the bill, under "Increase of the Navy," lines 2 to 8, inclusive, strike out the provision for two first-class battleships and insert in lieu of the provision for the same the following:

"Three submarines of seagoing type, to have a surface speed of not less than 20 knots, at a total cost not exceeding \$1,600,000 each, and 30 submarines of coast-defense type, at a total cost not exceeding \$665,000 each, and the sum of \$10,000,000 is hereby appropriated for said purposes, to be available until expended."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PADGETT. I want to reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. MANN. What is this amendment a substitute for?

Mr. SLAYDEN. For the paragraph at the top of page 64.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment, but I will allow the chairman of the committee to first discuss his point of order to the amendment of the gentleman from Texas.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee make or reserve the point of order?

Mr. PADGETT. I will reserve the point of order.

Mr. MANN. If one of them is subject to a point of order, the other is.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the Chair to recognize me to offer an amendment as a member of the committee.